DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 902	RC 007 369

AUTHOR	Larson, James R.
TITLE	Community Involvement and Educational Decision Making; The Development of a Mexican American Curriculum Office in the Toledo Public Schools.
PUB DATE	Dec 72
NOTE	199p.; Doctor's Dissertation, University of Toledo
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Advisory Committees; *Community Involvement; Curriculum; *Decision Making; *Doctoral Theses; Educational Improvement; Ethnic Studies; *Mexican Americans; *Offices (Facilities); Organizations (Groups); Public Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Ohio; *Toledo Public Schools

ABSTRACT

Investigating the process which led to the development of a Mexican American Curriculum Office within the Toledo Public Schools, the study examined the efforts of the Mexican American community to improve education in those schools. These efforts, which began in the spring 1970 and winter 1971, became a part of the proposal process for an Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title III grant for the system. Data were collected by personal interviews with Mexican American community leaders and their allies and educational decision makers and their allies. Interviews on educational issues conducted with many of the same individuals were used to validate the information. Original documents and audio-tapes of all Community Advisory Council (CAC) meetings were also used. A majority of the negotiating time was devoted to the role and function of the CAC. The school system resisted the input of the Council's more radical elements, while they supported the conservative representatives. The pressure placed on the school system originated under the supervision of a community organizing agency external to the Mexican American community. The study ended with the hiring of the project director in the fall of 1971. (Author/NQ)

ED 082902

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RECEIVED
NOV 5 1973
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

A Dissertation

entitled

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND EDUCATIONAL DECISION MAKING; THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MEXICAN AMERICAN CURRICULUM OFFICE IN THE TOLEDO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

by
James R. Larson

as partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
Doctor of Philosophy Degree
in Curriculum and Teaching

Adviser

Committee Member

Committee Member

Dean of the Graduate School

The University of Toledo
December, 1972

RC007369

Dr. James R. Larson
6059 Glenbeigh Drive
Sylvania, Ohio 43560

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

An Abstract of

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND EDUCATIONAL DECISION MAKING; THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MEXICAN AMERICAN CURRICULUM OFFICE IN THE TOLEDO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

James R. Larson

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of
the Doctor of Philosophy Degree

The University of Toledo
December 1972

The object of this study was to examine the dynamics of one specific series of community confrontations with public school decision makers. Questions which guided the investigation were:

1. What were the organizing forces that created the pressure which resulted in the forming of the Community Advisory Council?

2. What did the Mexican American community, as represented by the Community Advisory Council, perceive as deficient in the educational programs offered their children?

3. What role did the Community Advisory Council feel the Mexican American community should play in the change process?

4. Who did the members of the Community Advisory Council and the educational decision makers perceive as leaders of the Mexican American community, and how did these leaders' perceptions of the need for community control differ from interest group to interest group within the Mexican American community?

5. How did the Community Advisory Council and the educational decision makers negotiate their differences?

6. Can suggested guidelines for successful community involvement in educational decision making be formulated as a result of this study?

The problem investigated was the process which led to the development of a Mexican American Curriculum Office within the Toledo (Ohio) Public Schools. The study examined the efforts of elements of the Toledo Mexican American community to improve the education of their children in the Toledo Public Schools. These efforts began approximately in spring, 1970, and in winter, 1971, became a part of the process for a formal proposal for an Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title III, Section 306, grant for the school system from the United States Office of Education.

A major data source for the study consisted of personal interviews with Mexican American community leaders and their allies and educational decision makers and their allies. In addition, interviews conducted with many of the same individuals concerning educational issues by another researcher were used to validate the information. Original documents and audio-tapes of all Community Advisory Council meetings were also used by the researcher.

The pressure placed upon the school system was found to have originated under the supervision of a community organizing agnecy external to the Mexican American community. A majority of the time in the negotiating sessions was devoted to discussions on the role and function of the Community Advisory Council. The school system resisted the input of the more radical elements of the council, while they supported the conservative representatives. The negotiations were complicated by the maneuverings for power among the various community groups represented on the council. The study ended with the hiring of the project director in fall, 1971.

Based upon the findings, it was recommended that:

1. School systems should dispell any attitude of paternalism on their part and work toward the concept of parity with the community group.

2. Advisory councils should include all segments of the community to be served by the results of any negotiations.

3. School systems should not present a plan, however appropriate it might appear, to be reacted to by an advisory council.

4. Negotiations should not be constrained by the pressure of time.

5. School systems should learn as much as possible, as objectively as possible, about the community with which they are negotiating.

6. Boards of Education should conceive policies on community advisory councils to present to such groups at their inception.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

1. INTRODUCTION. 1
   - BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM. 1
   - PROBLEM TO BE INVESTIGATED 10
   - DEFINITION OF TERMS. 11
   - DESIGN OF THE STUDY. 13
     - Sources of Data 14
     - Collection of Data. 16
     - Evaluation of Data. 17
   - SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY. 18
   - LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY 19
   - OVERVIEW 19
2. RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH 21
   - INTRODUCTION 21
   - COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL DECISION MAKING 21
     - Community Power Structure 22
     - Decentralization. 27
     - Community Involvement 30
     - Federal Role in Community Involvement 42
   - EDUCATION OF MEXICAN AMERICANS 46
     - General Educational Studies 48
     - Community Involvement 55
   - SUMMARY. 59

Chapter Page

3. BACKGROUND OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE EDUCATIONAL COMMUNITY 61

INTRODUCTION 61

DESCRIPTION OF THE CITY AND THE SCHOOL SYSTEM 61

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT WITH FEDERAL PROGRAMS 62

Title I, ESEA, Advisory Councils 62

Title III, ESEA, Projects 66

Model Cities 67

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT WITH LOCALLY INITIATED PROJECTS 69

Human Relations Department 70

Study for the Seventies 71

SUMMARY 79

4. BACKGROUND OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE MEXICAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY 80

INTRODUCTION 80

DESCRIPTION OF THE MEXICAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY 80

MEXICAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS 84

La Raza Unida 85

Los Latinos Unidos 86

Farm Labor Organizing Committee 87

Brown Berets of Northwest Ohio 91

North Toledo Corridor Area Corporation 93

ALLIED COMMUNITY AGENCIES 93

Migrant Division, Economic Opportunity Planning Association of Greater Toledo 93

Department for the Spanish-Speaking of the Office of Community Relations, Catholic Diocese of Toledo 94

Chapter
Page

Toledo Metropolitan Mission 95

Advocates for Basic Legal Equality. 97

MEXICAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES. . 98

Luna Pier 98

Guadalupe Center. 100

SUMMARY. 103

5. THE MEXICAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY'S BEGINNING INVOLVEMENT WITH THE SCHOOL SYSTEM 106

INTRODUCTION 106

COMMUNITY PRESSURE IS APPLIED. 106

SUMMARY. 122

6. JOINT PLANNING FOR A FEDERAL GRANT PROPOSAL 124

INTRODUCTION 124

THE SCHOOL SYSTEM SEEKS FEDERAL FUNDS. 124

The Prospectus. 124

The Preliminary Proposal. 127

PLANNING FOR SUBMISSION OF THE FORMAL PROPOSAL . . . 129

Section 306 Community Involvement Guidelines. . . 129

Forming the Community Advisory Council. 131

Joint Planning Efforts. 135

SUMMARY. 145

7. JOINT PLANNING FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF MACO 147

INTRODUCTION 147

THE HIRING FREEZE. 147

FORMING A PERSONNEL COMMITTEE. 152

Chapter

Page

Negotiations for Community Involvement in Personnel Selection 152

Personnel Committee Actions. 159

CONTINUING CONCERNS OF THE COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL. 160

SUMMARY 162

8. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS. 164

QUESTIONS OF THE STUDY. 164

SUMMARY 165

CONCLUSIONS 168

RECOMMENDATIONS 172

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 174

APPENDICES. . . . .

APPENDIX A A CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MEXICAN AMERICAN CURRICULUM OFFICE. 185

APPENDIX B THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF THE COMMUNITY COUNCIL. 193

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

The concept of the community's forming, controlling, and monitoring functions of the educational institution is at the very core of the origins of the American public schools. America's earliest schools were founded by concerned neighbors who wanted schooling for their children. Governance of these schools was carried on through the institution of local school boards, whose members were chosen from the immediate community. The community participated in a continuing fashion by voting in various types of referendum elections dealing primarily with school finance. Further involvement came through the community's attendance and participation in meetings ranging from those of the Board of Education and Parent Teacher Associations to individual conferences between a teacher and a parent.

These basic participatory functions have not changed. What has changed however, is the growing distance between the public schools and their clients, especially in our urban areas. Local school boards just do not seem local to vast numbers of our increasingly diversified urban populace. As our population has grown, so has this identity crisis.

The American public has always made a great many demands upon its public schools. These demands are arriving in increasing vigorous and diverse forms. Quite often they have been concerned with such issues as financial support, food quality, or physical facilities. These types of demands, while not waning in number, are being surpassed in intensity by demands for curricular accountability. Such confrontations deal with the quality of instruction, the specifics of what and how some particular concept or body of knowledge is to be taught, and a general demand for increased achievement levels.

These calls for accountability in the curricular areas are being issued by several types of pressure groups. Pressure is being applied to the school administration from many parts of the political spectrum as well as from the various client groups served by the public schools. Racial and ethnic groups, religious and patriotic organizations, and groups centrally concerned with a particular discipline or subject matter area appear to be combining with local and national level organizations of parents, students, and politicians to bring pressures upon the public schools.

In particular, it is in dealing with the rising expectations and dissatisfactions of racial and ethnic minorities in their quest for improved education and ethnic-modification of the curriculum, that educational decision makers most often become trapped in a cross-fire of conflicting demands and counter-demands. Boards of education and school administrators have become accustomed to dealing with traditional interest groups, which rarely are open or salient, which usually have closed membership and hold private meetings, and which rarely bargain in the open. The newer community groups and coalitions are open, large and nonselective in their membership, hold public meetings, and argue positions before the board in public. "Shaping public policy to the demands of one group arouses competing demands from others, and in such open, hostile situations it is difficult to work out compromises."[1] What might appear to the educational decision makers as a legitimate (acceptable) demand of a representative spokesman for a minority group might turn out in reality to be against the wishes of a majority of that minority. Thus, a school system may implement demanded changes only to discover that the modification is perceived by another group to be capitulation. In addition, educational decision makers often find it difficult to distinguish between those who want community control in order to fulfill achievement expectations and those who question the very legitimacy of the schools as a viable institution.

The educational demands of minority ethnic groups have been centered increasingly in the concept of community control of the public schools. According to Fantini, Gittell, and Magat, "the concept of community control of urban education was given almost no serious consideration until the late 1960's."[2] The changing power relationships that began to develop in the urban areas as a result of the civil rights movement, a growing awareness of the failure of integration as a viable vehicle toward equality, and the apparent failure of public education to meet the needs of the children in the urban ghettos and barrios all served as stimuli for the growth of the community control concept. In addition, the public school was being left to stand alone with the police and fire department functions as the only public institutions left in the urban core. The middle class population moved out and their churches followed them, as did major business and corporation headquarters. The public school is thus not only immediately visible, but also vulnerable. Education is seen as the main way up and out of an urban ghetto and barrio. The community is not seeking acculturation as had past residents of these areas, but, as Wilcox stated, "the thrust for control over ghetto schools represents a shift in emphasis by black and poor people from a concern with replicating that which is American to a desire for reshaping it to include their concerns."[3]

---

[1] Robert F. Lyke, "Representation and Urban School Boards," Community Control of Schools, ed. Henry M. Levin (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1970), p. 153.

[2] Mario Fantini, Marilyn Gittell, and Richard Magat, Community Control and the Urban School (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970), p. xiii.

Fantini, Gittel, and Magat pointed out that "cracks in the professional educator's monopoly" had begun to develop prior to the thrust towards community control. They offered as examples, the critics that became vocal after Sputnik, Supreme Court decisions, psychologists and revised learning theories, political scientists interested in the schools as a governmental organization, sociologists and the study of dynamics, journalists, economists, and even novelists. These authors saw the movement for real community voice in public education gathering strength just as "underlying assumptions in the main efforts to overcome educational poverty were being fractured."[4] They were referring to the release of the Coleman Report[5] as well as a general leveling off of federal funds for education due to Vietnam.

The opening round in the battle for local community control of public schools occurred in the vast New York city school system. Under pressure from various fronts the New York City Board of Education in 1967 created three demonstration districts for community participation.

---

[3] Preston Wilcox, "The Thrust Toward Community Control of the Schools in Black Communities," Racial Crisis in American Education, ed. Robert L. Green (Chicago: Follett Educational Corporation, 1969), p. 310.

[4] Fantini, Gittell, and Magat, pp. 20-21.

[5] Commissioned by Congress in the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and published in 1966, the Coleman Report (Equality of Educational Opportunity) was an exhaustive study of educational achievement in the American public schools.

Intermediate School (I.S.) 201, located in East Harlem had become, in 1966, the first school to begin working under a community participation concept as developed by the New York City Board of Education. Participation soon evolved into control. According to a community leader, the essence of the struggle at I.S. 201 was

> to actively communicate to the black and poor residents in Harlem that they had to build their own dreams and that the system in the last analysis was organized for the protection of others -- not black Americans. Intrinsic to the struggle was the potential for convincing the students at I.S. 201 that they could be black and successful.[6]

The continued struggle for community control within the New York City schools attracted nationwide attention throughout 1967, and culminated in a city-wide seven-week strike by the United Federation of Teachers in the fall of 1968. The controversy centered around the Ocean-Hill Brownsville district, located in a Brooklyn ghetto.

Since these opening rounds, other urban school districts have felt the heat of community pressure for community control. Oftentimes the response by the boards of education has been centered around decentralization. Large school districts, such as Detroit, Los Angeles, and Boston have initiated one form or another of decentralization. While the terms "community control" and "decentralization" appear together quite often in print and in board of education memoranda, decentralization alone is not the answer to the cries for community control. "The frustration and failure that led up to the community control dispute in New York City actually built up during a period when the city's schools were more administratively decentralized than ever in their modern history."[7]

---

[6] Wilcox, p. 300.

[7] Fantini, Gittell, and Magat, p. 98.

The issue of community control of schools is wrapped within many layers of contributing factors: general grass roots' movements in all political areas, rising teacher professionalism, decentralization as a means of reducing the complexity of our school systems, racism, parent dissatisfaction with the quality of educational opportunities, and the general problems associated with the processes of urbanization and industrialization. As Fantini wrote: "What is the process by which a major social institution like the schools is reformed in an open society?"[8] An active parent leader in the Bronx suggested one answer: "We parents must take our schools back from that system. We must do everything we can to fight it, restructure it, or destroy it. If we want our children to get the education they need, we must return our schools to them."[9] Fantini stated the situation another way: "The curtain has come down on solo performances by professionals."[10]

Public school systems have turned to federal sources to fund educational programs for minority groups. These federal programs, such as Head Start, and the various Titles of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, in turn, require increased community participation in both the planning and implementation stages of the projects. Altshuler pointed out that the movement for community control was given impetus by the "maximum feasible participation" provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.[11] In addition, the Model Cities Program calls for widespread citizen participation in its functions. Thus, school systems which have never before faced the issue of community involvement are now being forced to involve communities by the requirements of the very programs they hoped would ease community pressures. Confronted by pressure from the federal agency and the local community, many systems are at a loss as to how to resolve such situations.

---

[8] Mario Fantini, The Reform of Urban Schools (Washington: National Education Association, 1970), p. 53.

[9] Ellen Lurie, How to Change the Schools: A Parent's Handbook on How to Fight the System (New York: Random House Vintage, 1970), p. 10.

[10] Fantini, p. 60.

[11] Alan Altshuler, Community Control: The Black Demand for Participation in Large American Cities (New York: Pegasus, 1970), p. 189.

A tentative implication may be drawn that the phenomenon of community involvement in school district decision making procedures is spreading to school districts of all sizes, not just the large urban centers. A further tentative implication is that this issue has entered the area of curriculum and instruction, especially through Titles I and III of ESEA.

Much of the discussion and writing with regard to the community control issue limits the conflict to a black-white confrontation. "Conflict over community control and de facto segregation of schools," wrote Billings, "represents nothing more or less than a struggle for power between blacks and whites."[12] The nation's second largest minority --the Mexican Americans--are also victims of many of the same discriminations in educational opportunities, but with an additional complicating factor of language.

Between 1950 and 1960, Mexican Americans urbanized more rapidly than Anglos or nonwhites. The general problems connected with their urbanization, along with the discrimination they suffered in their rural situations, have together contributed to a very low educational status for the Mexican American. Although based upon the Mexican American population of the Southwest United States, where a majority live, the following basic educational data from the 1960 U.S. Census highlight some of their problems.[13]

---

[12] Charles E. Billings, "Community Control of the School and the Quest for Power," Phi Delta Kappan, LIII (January, 1972), p. 277.

1. Mexican Americans fourteen years and over in 1960 averaged about four years less schooling then Anglos and one and a half years less than nonwhites.

2. The incidence of functional illiteracy (0-4 years of school) was seven times the Anglo and nearly twice the nonwhite rate.

3. Only 13 percent of the Spanish-surname persons had four years of high school as against 28 percent of Anglos and 19 percent of nonwhites.

4. Less than 6 percent of the Mexican Americans had some college education, which was half the nonwhite percentage and a quarter of the Anglo rate.

Despite this generally low achievement level, Carter has pointed out that

> Low status Mexican American parents tend to see the school as staffed by highly trained professionals having the best interests of their children at heart, often failing to recognize that a child's success in school depends greatly on the appropriate participation of his parents.[14]

Carter suggested that "Mexican Americans generally maintain positive feelings about 'education' in the abstract but tend to view the institution negatively."[15] Mexican American leaders, such as Armando Rodriquez, at one time Director of the United States Office of Education's Mexican-American Affairs Unit, called for increased community participation in the running of the public schools. "Unless Mexican-Americans are in the driver's seat, such changes that are now possible with the intensified focus of the federal government will be slow in coming--or may not come at all."[16]

---

[13] Leo Grebler, Joan W. Moore, and Ralph C. Guzman, The Mexican-American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority (New York: The Free Press, 1970), pp. 13; 18.

[14] Thomas P Carter, Mexican-Americans in School: A History of Educational Neglect (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970), p. 135.

Steiner wrote that the issue of community control is the one issue that has done more to unite the barrio than any other. He saw this revolution in the schools as a "paradox that is supported by the Chicano activists and the Anglo establishment, at least federally, with equal fervor."[17] Mexican Americans have been the recipients of a great deal of recent federal attention. Head Start and other such programs were troublesome, claimed Ortego, hence "the only viable alternative many Mexican-American educators feel, lies in creating special programs which they can control and which provide for community input in their development."[18]

It appears that there is a need to examine the dynamics of community confrontations with the public school decision makers. Educational planners must listen and deal effectively with community pressure groups more than ever before. Boards of education and school system decision makers can no longer attempt to pacify groups; but as Dodson observed, must assume a new role, that of "negotiator, trader, referee, umpire, whatever you want to call it, but whose great skill in the future will need to. . . deal with these power blocks who come to confrontation with each other in the community on an organized basis."[19] A study of one such series of encounters appears to be one step toward improved communications, processes, and programs among all those concerned with education.

---

[15] Carter, p. 147.

[16] Armando M. Rodriquez, "How Sharp is the Focus?" Educating the Mexican American, eds. Henry Sioux Johnson and William J. Hernandez-M (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1970), p. 309.

[17] Stan Steiner, LaRaza: The Mexican-Americans (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1970), pp. 227-228.

[18] Philip D. Ortego, "Schools for Mexican-Americans: Between Two Cultures Saturday Review, LIV (April 17, 1971), p. 81.

PROBLEM TO BE INVESTIGATED

The basic problem to be investigated is the process which led to the development of a Mexican-American Curriculum Office within the Toledo (Ohio) Public Schools. The study will examine the efforts of elements of the Toledo Mexican American community to improve the education of their children in the Toledo Public Schools. These efforts began approximately in spring, 1970, and in winter, 1971, became a part of the process for a formal proposal for an Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title III, Section 306, grant for the Toledo Public Schools from the United States Office of Education. This formal proposal, approved and funded in spring, 1971, provided for the establishment of a Mexican-American Curriculum Office within the school system.

The questions that will guide this study are:

1. What were the organizing forces that created the pressure which resulted in the forming of the Community Advisory Council?

---

[19] Dan W. Dodson, "New Forces Operating in Educational Decision-Making," Integrated Education: A Reader, ed. Meyer Weinberg (Beverly Hills: The Glencoe Press, 1968), p. 19.

2. What did the Mexican American community, as represented by the Community Advisory Council, perceive as deficient in the educational programs offered their children?

3. What role did the Community Advisory Council feel the Mexican American community should play in the change process?

4. Who did the members of the Community Advisory Council and the educational decision makers perceive as leaders of the Mexican American community and how did these leaders' perceptions of the need for community control differ from interest group to interest group within the Mexican American community?

5. How did the Community Advisory Council and the educational decision makers negotiate their differences?

6. Can suggested guidelines for successful community involvement in educational decision making be formulated as a result of this study?

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The terms defined in this section are those used in a particular sense throughout this dissertation. It is especially important to understand that what Mexican Americans call themselves or want to be called is a matter of some sensitivity.

1. Chicano: A term chosen by the Mexican American youth to identify themselves. "This word not only furnishes identity; it carries a whole philosophical meaning. A Chicano is a person who is proud of his heritage, a person who is responsible and committed to helping

others of his people."[20] Not a new word, it derives from a pronunciation of "Mexicano" and was originally used in a disparaging way by the Mexican upper class to refer to the lower class. The word remains insulting to some Mexican Americans. Used in this dissertation, the word refers to Mexican American youth who desire to be identified with the Chicano movement.

2. Mexican American: The most widely accepted term used to identify Americans of Mexican descent. The absence of the hyphen is important as it signifies to some that a "Mexican-American" is not considered equal to other Americans. "The difference between a Mexican-American and a Chicano is a philosophical and ideological one."[21] Mexican American will be used in this dissertation except where "Mexican-American" appears in the words of an author.

3. Anglo: Any person who is not black, Indian, Asian or Latin. It does not imply the sympathies of a person nor does it carry any negative connotations.

4. MACO: An acronym used to refer to the "Mexican-American Curriculum Office" of the Toledo Public Schools.

5. Decentralization: "A magerial technique whereby a central authority delegates functional responsibility and some decision-making to officials of subunits of the local school system, each of whom administers schools in a particular geographic area."[22]

---

[20] Ernie Barrios (ed.), Bibliografia De Aztlan: An Annotated Chicano Bibliography (San Diego: Centro De Estudios Chicanos Publications, San Diego State College, 1971), p. xvii.

[21] Barrios, p. xvii.

[22] Educational Research Service, Decentralization and Community Involvement: A Status Report, Circular No. 7 (Washington: Educational Research Service, 1969), p. 1.

6. Community control: This term implies some form of administrative decentralization with "decision-making and responsibility regarding the expenditure of money, by an elected group representative of the community served by a school or a group of schools."[23]

7. Community participation: "Any systematic and structured method for enlisting community assistance and advice in the decision-making process."[24]

8. Community involvement: As used in this dissertation the term implies a mid point on a continuum extending from community participation to community control. Community involvement implies more than assistance and advice but less than full fiscal and hiring authority.

9. ESEA: An acronym used to refer to the "Elementary and Secondary Education Act" of 1965.

10. Title III: Refers to one of the six titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

11. Section 306: Refers to a section amended to ESEA Title III in April 1970 which gives authority to the Commissioner of Education for funding special programs and projects.

12. USOE: An acronym used to refer to the "United States Office of Education."

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The period covered in this study was from the first organizing activities of the various elements within the Mexican American community confronting the school administration in the spring of 1970 to the first formal meeting of the MACO Community Advisory Council with the newly-hired Project Director in October, 1971.

---

[23] Educational Research Service, p. 1.

[24] Educational Research Service, p. 1.

Sources of Data

A major data source for this study consisted of personal interviews with the following types of individuals.

Community leaders and their allies:

1. Those identified on the federal grant proposal as members of the community Advisory Council and who played a significant and leading role in the negotiations as determined through personal knowledge of this writer as well as through the general research activities of this study.

2. Those identified in the interviews to be effective community leaders not identified on the formal propoasl as members of the Community Advisory Council, both Mexican American and Anglo.

Educational decision makers and their allies:

1. Those on the federal level in the USOE involved in setting the guidelines for community involvement in ESEA Title III, Section 306 projects.

2. Those on the State of Ohio Department of Education level who were involved in the recommendation process of the grant proposal.

3. Those on the local level (Toledo Public Schools) in a position of decision making in regard to the MACO project. Such positions included:

   a. Superintendent of Schools

   b. Deputy Superintendent of Schools

c. Assistant Superintendent of Schools

d. Executive Director of State and Federal Programs

Members of organizations or institutions not identified as community groups but nevertheless involved in the negotiation process were also interviewed. Such types of individuals included:

1. Representatives of the Toledo Catholic Diocese

2. Representatives of the Toledo Metropolitan Mission, a department of the Toledo Area Council of Churches

3. Representatives of the Advocates for Basic Legal Equality (ABLE)

In addition to the above interviews conducted by this writer, access was granted to tapes of interviews with eleven of the same community individuals conducted by a Master's degree candidate during the summer of 1971. The objectives of that study included describing "the conditions of the Mexican American community in Toledo;" recounting "the attitudes of selected Mexican American leaders regarding strategies and solutions to existing educational problems;" and analyzing "the attitudes of these leaders."[25] With reference to questions concerning education, the focus was on the MACO project.

Original documents and other media sources were analyzed as a part of the study. Such documents included:

1. Statements made before public Board of Education meetings by elements of the Mexican American community

---

[25] Edward Bobowski, "An Examination of Educational Attitudes of Selected Mexican American Leaders in Toledo," (unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Toledo, 1972), p. 8.

2. Communications to the school system from the community

3. Board of Education and school administration replies to the community

4. School system inter-office communications and meeting notes

5. Various levels of the federal grant proposals

6. Various documents exchanged between the community and the school system during negotiations

7. Audio-tapes and minutes of the Community Advisory Council meetings

8. Minutes of public meetings of the Board of Education

9. Press releases and newspaper articles

10. Various government publications dealing with the subject of community involvement in educational decision making

Collection of Data

Personal interviews were conducted with ten members of the community and their allies. Seven educational decision makers were also personally interviewed. Although each interview was geared to the individual and his role in the development process of the MACO project, the basic structure of each session was the same. The outline and direction of each interview consisted of the following questions.

1. In what areas do you see the greatest need for change and improvement in the education of Mexican American children in the Toledo Public Schools?

2. What part should the Mexican American community play in bringing about such change?

3. How can the Mexican American community influence such desired change? What are the obstacles to this desired change?

4. Who are the most effective leaders and groups within the Mexican American community that deal with the Toledo Public Schools? Why? Who are the least effective? Why?

5. How did MACO come about? Is the Advisory Council a representative one? Are there obstacles to the success of MACO? How can the Advisory Council be made more representative?

6. How have such problems as the Guadalupe Center and Luna Pier controversies affected MACO?

Permission was granted in all cases for the interviews to be audio-taped. The average length of the interviews was forty-five minutes.

The majority of the original documents examined during the study were from the files of the educational decision makers involved in the formulation of MACO. With the permission of the individuals involved, all requested documents were personally removed from the files by this writer, photocopyed, and returned. The number of such documents totaled 125. It is the assumption of this writer that such documents were genuine and included all written material circulated among the educational decision makers during the negotiations with the community.

Evaluation of Data

The issue of a possible hostility toward or distrust of the interviewer on the part of the community members is recognized. This possible distrust many have affected the person being interviewed because the interviewer was both an Anglo and had been closely allied with the development of the MACO project as an educational decision maker. It is felt however, that the existence of the Bobowski interviews and their comparative use by this writer aided in not only determining any misinformation giving but also correcting any such occurances in the six cases where the interviews overlapped.

With reference to the validity of the original document sources, the combination of this writer's personal knowledge of the existence of the majority of the papers and his personal removal of the documents from the files of the educational decision makers have led to the assumption of their authenticity and completeness.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

An examination and review of the literature has drawn this writer to the conclusion that there is a paucity of historical research in the area under consideration in this dissertation. "Scholarly papers on community control of urban education," wrote Fantini, Gittell, and Magat, "generally deal with the community school (which is not synonymous with the community control of the schools) and with participation in theory rather than in relation to its educational consequences, both curricular and institutional."[26]

School systems are facing the issues discussed in this dissertation with increasing frequency. Several types of research are needed in order to examine the issue of community involvement, especially those that are decision oriented. The examination of what transpired in one urban school system should provide some lessons for school systems not yet touched by the issue under study. This study should aid in the identification of emerging patterns of community involvement in educational decision making.

---

[26] Fantini, Gittell, and Magat, p. xv.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

An important area of bias in this study is the researcher's prior role as one of the educational decision makers involved in direct negotiations with the Mexican American community. As the Director of Social Studies for the Toledo Public Schools, this writer was a co-author of the formal proposal. Along with the Director of Evaluation, this writer met consistently in negotiations with the community. This presence at the confrontations, along with the co-authorship of the grant proposal will tend to add depth to the account. On the other hand it is recognized that the researcher's prior role is a possible limitation as to objectivity in reporting the findings in this study.

The nature of the sample interviewed and of the study itself will not allow for generalizing to other populations. Conclusions may still be drawn, however, as to the effect of community involvement upon the educational decision makers and their planning activities of the school system involved. Based upon these conclusions, suggestions for improved community negotiations and cooperative educational development may be formulated.

OVERVIEW

This chapter has presented the background of the problem, the problem to be investigated, a definition of terms, the design of the study, its significance, and its limitations.

In Chapter 2, a review of the related literature is presented.

In Chapter 3, the background of community involvement from the perspective of the educational community--federal, state, and local--is presented.

In Chapter 4, the background of community involvement from the perspective of the Mexican American community is detailed.

In Chapter 5, the Mexican American community's beginning involvement with the Toledo Public Schools is examined.

In Chapter 6, the joint planning for the federal grant proposal is discussed.

In Chapter 7, the joint planning for the implementation of the MACO project is examined.

In Chapter 8, conclusions and recommendations are presented.

Chapter 2

RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

INTRODUCTION

This chapter will examine the literature and research concerning community involvement in educational decision making. In addition, a review of the material dealing with the educational plight of the Mexican American will be presented.

Community power-structure studies, decentralization, community involvement, and the federal role comprise the first concept. General educational studies of Mexican Americans and their community involvement tendencies comprise the second.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL DECISION MAKING

The issue of community involvement in educational decision making falls within the realm of what may be termed the politics of education. Politics being a value-ladden word, it is defined for this context as a "neutral and descriptive term which refers to the formulation of public policies and the machinery through which these are expressed."[1]

---

[1] Gordon N. McKenzie, "Sources and Process in Curriculum Development," What are the Sources of the Curriculum? A Symposium, ed. Robert R. Leeper (Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1962), p. 76.

Kirst and Mosher stated that "the politics of education is a new and still largely uncharted area of research concentration."[2] They concurred with Schoettle[3] that no single focus was capable of describing all of the variations of the educational policy-making process, and presented Schoettle's seven categories of studies. The final category--the influence of elites or community power structures on educational policies and programs[4]--represented those studies most relevant for this study. An examination of the several schools of thought concerning community power structures is a necessary beginning in understanding the theoretical basis for governance trends in urban education.

Community Power Structure

Merelman[5] has pointed out that the study of American community power has followed a dialectical pattern in which a series of assertations were advanced, attacked, and then reasserted by new advocates of the original position, tempered by the findings of the second position studies.

The beginnings of the study of community power as a distinct field of investigation took the form of an "elitist" or "reputational" school of thought. Founded primarily by Hunter,[6] the premise of this school was that "communities were controlled by 'elites,' usually economic, who imposed their will, often covertly, on non-elites."

---

[2] Michael W. Kirst and Edith K. Mosher, "Politics of Education," Review of Educational Research, XXXIX (December, 1969), pp. 623-640.

[3] Enid Bok Curtis Schoettle, "The State of the Art in Policy Studies," The Study of Policy Formation, eds. Raymond A. Bauer and Kenneth J. Gargen (New York: The Free Press, 1968).

[4] Kirst and Mosher, p. 632.

[5] Richard M. Merelman, "On the Neo-Elitist Critique of Community Power," American Political Science Review, LXII (June, 1968), p. 451.

In his study of Regional City, Hunter concluded that a monolithic power structure was in control of the political decision making process. Briefly stated, Hunter employed what has become known as the reputational technique, in which powerful leaders were identified by other individuals in leading roles in the city.[8] Other reputational studies include those by Schulze and Blumberg, Klapp and Padgett, and Mills.[9]

According to Hencley, the "pluralists" (the second school of thought) criticised Hunter's study because he (1) confused potential power with actual power; (2) failed to examine the role of economic dominants in the actual resolution of community issues, and (3) assumed that the crucial decision-makers remained the same from issue-area to issue-area.[10]

This second phase turned toward a "pluralist" point of view. "The pluralists concluded that shifting coalitions of participants drawn from all areas of community life actually controlled local politics."[11] Issue analysis was the basic technique employed by this school. Centered around Dahl,[12] the strengths and shortcomings of the pluralist position, according to Hencley, were that while they have made evidence available about community systems and offered a range of propositions, their studies were narrow and neglected the relationships between political behavior and social structure.[13]

---

[6] Floyd Hunter, Community Power Structure (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953).

[7] Merelman, p. 451.

[8] Stephen P. Hencley, "The Study of Community Politics and Power," The Politics of Education in the Local Community, eds. Robert S. Cahill and Stephen P. Hencley (Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1964), p. 10.

[9] Robert O. Schulze and Leonard U. Blumberg, "The Determination of Local Power Elites," American Journal of Sociology, LXII (November, 1957), pp. 290-296; Orrin E. Klapp and Vincent L. Padgett, "Power Structure and Decision-Making in a Mexican Border City," American Journal of Sociology, LXV (January, 1960), pp. 400-406; and, C. Wright Mills, The Power Elite (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956).

[10] Hencley, p. 14.

Other pluralists include Polsby, and Wolfinger.[14]

According to Merelman, a third stage of studies developed--a "neo-elitist" view. He saw this school as differing with the pluralists, and charged that pluralists misunderstood the way influence expressed itself, were only successful in assessing power in a conflict situation, and stressed governmental studies.[15]

The neo-elitists developed a theory on the role of non-decision making, which they claimed reestablished the dominance of single elites. Neo-elitists include Bachrach and Baratz, Schattschneider, and Vidich and Bensman.[16]

---

[11] Merelman, p. 451.

[12] Robert A. Dahl, Who Governs? (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961).

[13] Hencley, pp. 18-19.

[14] Nelson W. Polsby, Community Power and Political Theory (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963); and, Raymond E. Wolfinger, "Reputation and Reality in the Study of Community Power," American Sociological Review XXV (October, 1960), pp. 636-644.

[15] Merelman, p. 452.

[16] Peter Bachrach and Morton S. Baratz, "Decisions and Non-Decisions: An Analytical Framework," American Political Science Review, LVII (September, 1963), pp. 632-642; E. E. Schattschneider, The Semisovereign People (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1963); and, Arthur J. Vidich and Joseph Bensman, Small Town in Mass Society (Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1963).

There have been studies of community power structures that have combined the various techniques and positions, especially in education.[17]

Wilson traced the studies of community power and came to the conclusion that "in the last two decades since World War Two almost every published reference to the community has been made obsolete."[18] He contended that the balance of power between local and non-local social forces shifted to the non-local side. The power structure of the community can no longer be equated with its class structure.[19]

Wilson referred to the rural community studies of Warner, Hollingshead, and Lynd[20] as classics, and relevant for their time, but inappropriate for urban processes. He did not mention his own start with that type of a rural study.[21] Without criticizing the power studies of the last thirty years Wilson stated that it was invalid to use previous methods on present urban situations.[22]

---

[17] See: Daniel L. Apling, "An Analysis of a Large-City Mayor's Influence with Regard to Educational Decision-Making," (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, The University of Toledo, 1970); Alvin C. Blome, "A Study in the Identification of Community Power Structure and Influence on Public School Issues," (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Iowa, 1963); and, John A. Spiess, "Community Power Structure and Influence: Relationships to Educational Administration," (unpublished Dictor's dissertation, University of Iowa, 1967).

[18] L. Craig Wilson, The Open Access Curriculum (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971), p. 104.

[19] Wilson, Open Access, p. 104.

[20] W. Lloyd Warner, Social Class in America (New York: Harper and Row, 1960); August B. Hollingshead, Elmtown's Youth (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1949); and Robert S. Lynd and Helen M. Lynd, Middletown (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1929).

[21] L. Craig Wilson, "Community Power Pressure and Control in Relation to Education in a Selected Country," (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1952).

Gittell criticized the community power studies by claiming that those with power have been studied while those without have been ignored. She contended that researchers rationalized multiple-elite structures as pluralism, and neglected the effect of increasing non-involvement.[23]

Campbell pointed out that the early studies in community power structures were by sociologists, then political scientists, and only more recently be educators.[24] Kimbrough felt that much of the research activity was based upon the formal decision-making structure and the official decision-makers.[25] Spiess concluded that the reputational methodology has been the major way used to analyze school situations. He also saw a "growing recognition of the increasingly pluralistic nature of our society" in more recent studies of school situations.[26]

---

[22] Wilson, Open Access, p. 105.

[23] Marilyn Gittell, "Community Control of Education," The Politics of Education, eds. Marilyn Gittell and Alan G. Hevesi (New York: Prager, 1969), p. 363; n. 3, p. 376.

[24] Roald F. Campbell, Luvern L. Cunningham, and Roderick F. McPhee, The Organization and Control of American Schools (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1965), p. 379.

[25] Ralph B. Kimbrough, Political Power and Educational Decision-Making (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964), p. 18.

[26] John A. Spiess, Community Power Study Applications of Educational Administration (Toledo: Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, College of Education, The Univeristy of Toledo, 1971), pp. 5-6, (Mimeographed).

Gittell and Heusesi wrote that the continuing methodological debate has increased general concern over the reality of community power structures.[27]

None of the studies cited spoke directly to the takeover or takeback attitude now held by many critics of the public schools. Billings stated the issue as

> a clash between those who have or expect to have power in the community by virtue of their proximity to the historical power base centered around the business ethic, as against those who have reason to believe that the ethic's essential pillar has a distinct racist cast.[28]

Decentralization

It is common to find the concepts of decentralization and community control discussed as one in the literature.[29] They do not however, have to be considered one and the same. Fantini, Gittell, and Magat stated that if a decentralized agency of government lacks sufficient decision-making authority it can serve to thwart the desires of a community by keeping them away from the source of real authority. They added that the "frustrations and failure" that resulted in the community control thrust in New York developed when the schools were more administratively decentralized than ever before.[30]

---

[27] Gittell and Hevesi, p. 19.

[28] Charles E. Billings, "Community Control of the School and the Quest for Power," Phi Delta Kappan, LIII (January, 1972), p. 278.

[29] Educational Research Service, Decentralization and Community Control: A Status Report, Circular No. 7 (Washington: Educational Research Service, 1969); Luvern I. Cunningham, "Decentralization: A Forward Step? Community Control Clouds the Issue," Nation's Schools, (May, 1969); Patricia Strandt, "Decentralization, Community Control--Where Do We Go From Here?" American Teacher, (May, 1969); and, C. Taylor Whittier, "A Look at Decentralization and Community Control," School Administrator, (January, 1969), pp. 15-16.

[30] Mario D. Fantini, Marilyn Gittell, and Richard Magat, Community Control and the Urban School (New York: Prager, 1970), pp. 13; 98.

Although this dissertation does not involve a discussion of decentralization, as pointed out above it is often intertwined with the issue of community control. For that reason, a discussion of the literature of decentralization is presented at this point.

The Burnetts claimed that most Americans respond positively to the concept of decentralizing authority. They further asserted that "it is not a new idea that a bureaucracy, . . . may grow so large and so centralized that it becomes inefficient and ineffective."[31]

As was stated in Chapter 1 above, the beginnings of the decentralization issue in modern public education can be traced to the New York City public schoosl in the late 1960's. Two books published during the early stages of that struggle advocated decentralization as a solution to New York's problems.[32]

Gittell examined how the school system made its decisions, and focused on the role of the community in the process. After examining areas of policy making, she concluded that the public participated only slightly in determining school policy. She also felt that the system provided little opportunity for such participation. Contending that key forces in New York City had abandoned public education, Gittell stated that "the end result is narrow or closed participation in large areas of nonvisible decision-making (by). . .

---

[31] Jacquetta H. and Joe R. Burnett, "Issues in School-Community Relations in the Present Period," A New Look at Progressive Education, ed. James R. Squire (Washington: ASCD, 1972), p. 346.

[32] Marilyn Gittell, Participants and Participation: A Study of School Policy in New York City (New York: Prager, 1966); and, David Rogers, 110 Livingston Street: Politics and Bureaucracy in the New York City Schools (New York: Random House, 1968).

an inside core of top supervisory personnel in the headquarters staff of the Board of Education."[33] She concluded that the best way to bring the community and the school together was through a specific decentralization plan that she offered, to be initiated by legislative fiat.

Rogers also studied the New York City school system and called for decentralization. His suggestions concentrated on administrative rearrangements at upper levels, to be effected by upper level decision makers. Wasserman criticized Rogers' suggestions as an attempt to "pour in some more democracy at the top and some of it will trickle down to the poor folks at the bottom."[34]

In 1967 the New York State Legislature directed Mayor Lindsay of New York City to prepare a report on effecting greater community participation in the running of that city's public schools. The committee charged with the task was headed by the President of the Ford Foundation, McGeorge Bundy. The essence of the committee's report was that the New York City public schools should be reorganized into a community school system of autonomous districts.[35] Fantini, the plan's chief architect, claimed that it "represents the first major comprehensive document on big city decentralization--on the politics and governance of urban educational systems."[36]

---

[33] Gittell, Participants, p. 46.

[34] Miriam Wasserman, The School Fix, NYC, USA (New York: Outerbridge and Dienstfrey, 1970), pp. 189-190.

[35] McGeorge Bundy and others, Reconnection for Learning: A Community School System for New York City (New York: Mayor's Advisory Panel on Decentralization of the New York City Schools, 1967).

[36] Mario D. Fantini, Interviewed in Why Teachers Strike: Teacher's Rights and Community Control, ed. Melvin Urofsky (Garden City: Doubleday Anchor, 1970), pp. 79-110.

In May 1969 the Educational Research Service of the American Association of School Administrators surveyed an unknown number of large school systems as to their administrative structure. Thirty-two systems were identified as in someway decentralized. The study did not reveal how many total districts were surveyed nor did it evaluate any of the plans.[37] A comparison of the list of these thirty-two identified districts with the thirty-seven largest standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas[38] revealed that twenty-one of these districts were represented. It appears from this finding that decentralization in one form or another is found in the majority of our large city school systems and furthermore, is not limited to any particular area or areas of the country.

Community Involvement

A major indictment made in the literature of community involvement is that of the increasing bureaucracy of the public schools. Harrison referred to the situation as "rigor mortis," stating that "it usually occurs when adherence to the rules of the organization, usually conceived as a means, becomes transferred into an end-in-itself."[39] Levine[40] saw the most important problems connected to such bureaucracy as institutional complexity and overload, goal displacement, deficiencies in communications and decision-making processes, and the social ans psychological distance between client and institution. Gitell[41] also claimed that bureaucracy was a problem, specifically the rigidity of middle management. Martin[42] saw two ways in which educators isolated themselves and their issues: by operating within the confines of a narrowly circumscribed special-interest structure, and by delineating the issues to be debated in an equally narrow and special interest fashion. He charged that educators felt more secure when dealing with an unstructured community. "With such a public the school spokesman have a better chance both of naming the subject to be discussed and of keeping the conversation on a technical level where professional considerations may be expected to prevail."[43]

---

[37] Educational Research Service, p. 2.

[38] Wilson C. Riles, The Urban Education Task Force Report, Final Report of the Task Force on Urban Education to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (New York: Prager, 1970), p. 51.

[39] William A. Harrison, "The Public and the Public Schools: The Need to Build a New Sense of Community," Special Report (Washington: National Committee for Support of the Public Schools, March, 1968), p. 2.

[40] Daniel U. Levine, "Concepts of Bureaucracy in Urban School Reform," Phi Delta Kappan, LII (February, 1971), pp. 329-333.

Webster[44] pointed out that educators reacted quickly and with fear to charges of prejudice and discrimination, and to the activities of civil rights groups. He claimed that great alarm, and anxiety resulted and that minority groups sensed and exploited the situation. Cunningham supported that assertation and added that "the sensitivity of school officials in many places has reached the point where innocent requests for information are interpreted as real or imagined attacks upon schools."[45]

---

[41] Marilyn Gittell, "Supervisors and Coordinators: Power in the System," Freedom, Bureaucracy, and Schooling, ed. Vernon F. Haubrich (Washington: ASCD, 1971), pp. 161-173; and, "The Potential for Change: Community Roles, The Journal of Negro Education, XL (Summer, 1971), pp. 216-224.

[42] Roscoe C. Martin, "School Government," Governing Education: A Reader on Politics, Power, and Public School Policy, ed. Alan Rosenthal (Garden City: Doubleday Anchor, 1969), p. 290.

[43] Martin, p. 288.

[44] Staten W. Webster, "When Schools and Parents in a Disadvantaged Community Clash: A Proposal," The Disadvantaged Learner: Knowing, Understanding, Educating, ed. Staten W. Webster (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing, 1966), p. 408.

Although he claimed that the bureaucracy of the schools was a problem, Harrison argued that urban school problems could not be explained away by that situation alone. His basic question was, "does the trouble lie with the school policy or with the flaws in the institutions which produce it?"[46] He pointed out two other elements involved: "public school policies have given little recognition to the changing nature of the American population. . .and friction in the technological revolution."[47]

Another element in the issue of community involvement is rising teacher professionalism. "It is ironic," wrote Martin, "that the achievement of professional maturity is frequently accompanied by the degenerate process which has come to be called bureaucracy."[48] Gittell[49] felt that teacher organizations would be a continuing source of opposition to any new community roles, while Salz[50] saw the growth of teacher professionalism and self-determination of minorities on a collision course.

One indicator of teacher reaction to community involvement in the form of local school board powers, was reported by the Research Division of the National Education Association in 1969.[51] In a random sample, an unknown number of classroom teachers were asked: "A major issue facing city school systems is community control whereby a local school board is elected to govern the schools in that particular section. Do you believe that this elected board should have the following rights?"

---

[45] Luvern I. Cunningham, "Leadership and Control of Education," Designing Education for the Future No. 2: Implications for Education of Prospective Charge in Society, eds. Edgar L. Morphet and Charles O. Ryan (New York: Citation Press, 1967), p. 182.

[46] Harrison, p. 1.

[47] Harrison, pp. 1-2.

[48] Martin, p. 277.

[49] Gittell, "Potential".

[50] Arthur E. Salz, "Local Control vs. Professionalism," Phi Delta Kappan, L (February, 1969), pp. 332-334.

A majority of urban teachers answered yes to all six statements, which included determination of curriculum and budget, and hiring, firing and transfering teachers and administrators, using due process. The lowest affirmative responses dealt with job security.[52]

It was the issue of job security that eventually led to the New York strikes. The president of the United Federation of Teachers denounced giving the community such power, and referred to community control as "the right of any local group to decide that the broader society can go to hell because they've got the right to mistreat individuals as they see fit."[53] Other views of the New York City school system community control issue are found in a variety of sources.[54]

Various national organizations of teachers and administrators affiliated with the National Education Association passed resolutions on decentralization and community control at their 1969 conventions.[55]

---

[51] Educational Research Service, p. 16.

[52] Educational Research Service, p. 16.

[53] Albert Shanker, Interviewed in Urofsky, pp. 155-180.

[54] See: Fantini, Gittell, and Magat; Wasserman; Urofsky; Maurice R. Berube and Marilyn Gittell (eds.), Confrontation at Ocean Hill-Brownsville: The New York School Strikes of 1968 (New York: Praeger, 1969); and, Martin Buskin, "Community Control at the Crossroads," School Management, XIII (March, 1969), pp. 31-36.

[55] Educational Research Service, pp. 52-53.

As ethnic groups tended to maintain positive feelings about education in the abstract but view the institution negatively, so these groups viewed the idea of community control and decentralization favorably, but were negative concerning the institutionalizing of them.

Fantini[56] presented what he felt were the basic concepts emerging from community involvement: public accountability, process, expectancy, socialization, and the preservation of diversity. Writing with Gittell and Magat,[57] he declared that community control could not be smothered nor discarded by a school system because it altered basic power relationships, pervaded all school functions, and was an open-ended concept.

Although both Fantini and Gitell advocated community control, they warned in separate articles[58] that parents and students should be involved rather than power seeking groups.

Fein charged that the movement for community control represented a rejection of liberal ideology. According to Fein, the liberal views society as an aggregate of independent individuals and thus has an affection for centralized and authoritarian forms of community. With reference to the recurring questions as to whether minority groups can do a better job of running the schools, Fein said "the word 'better' can only be taken to mean better according to some secular standards, and it is precisely these standards that are now rejected."[59] Hamilton[60] also addressed himself to the issue that minority groups no longer believe that it is sufficient to try to work with existing standards, or even try to increase the effectiveness of the school. He asserted that the very legitimacy of the educational institution is being questioned.

---

[56] Fantini, Reform, p. 54.

[57] Fantini, Gittell, and Magat, p. 231.

[58] Fantini, Reform, p. 60; and, Gittell, "Potential," p. 217.

Cunningham and Nystrand,[61] surveyed new forms of citizen participation in thirteen large cities and reported finding relatively few people who genuinely wished to destroy the public schools. The study examined who had participated and whom they represented, the forum for participation, issues considered, tactics used, successes, and the strength and weaknesses as seen by the interested parties. The authors recommended strengthening existing linkages for citizen participation as well as creating new ones, especially to involve poor and minority groups.

Gottesfeld[62] surveyed one section of the lower East Side of New York City. This low-income non-white community was asked to identify all the activities they felt were important for the education of the children of the area. Gottesfeld stated that the results allowed him

---

[59] Leonard J. Fein, "The Limits of Liberalism," Saturday Review, LII (June 20, 1970).

[60] Charles V. Hamilton, "Race and Education: A Search for Legitimacy," Harvard Educational Review, XXXVIII (Fall, 1969), pp. 669-684.

[61] Luvern L. Cunningham and Raphael O. Nystrand, Citizen Participation in School Affairs: A Report to the Urban Coalition, (Washington: The Urban Coalition, 1969).

[62] Harry Gottesfeld, "Educational Issues in a Low-Income Area as Seen by Community People and Educators," Phi Delta Kappan, LII (February, 1971), pp. 366-388.

to hypothesize that (1) militant parents who stress only the one issue of community involvement will not win over any segment of educators, (2) when community residents become actively involved in the schools, their viewpoint as to what is educationally important is likely to change and broaden; (3) parents with relatively little education will be more in favor of strict standards and against innovative programs in the schools. The author investigated the perceptions of the issues held by the community and the educators. He did not study the effect such perceptions might have on any educational decision-making processes within the school system.

Belasco and others[63] questioned a randomly stratified sample of an upstate New York community as well as the total professional teaching population of the city school system. Respondents were asked who they presently perceived had the decision making power and who they thought should have final control over a series of economic, administrative, and educational issues. The researchers' conclusions were that there was a potential for sharp conflict between community groups and the professional staff over the ideal distribution of authority, especially with reference to economic issues. The community desired greater control for itself and the school board, and less by the professional teacher than was desired by teachers. Community perceptions did not accurately reflect the existing decision-making practices. The authors warned that such current ignorance, while serving to avoid overt conflict, also increased the potential for future conflict. Other school-community studies include Carter and others, and Goldhammer.[64]

---

[63] James A. Belasco and others, "School Community Relations" (paper read at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March, 1970, Minneapolis, Minnesota).

One of the most consistent methods by which the community has voiced its concern to the schools has been by presenting such concerns to board of education officials. A Detroit parent however, considered such action as "an exercise in bureaucratic gymnastics and futility. . . parents will no longer experience the humiliation of presenting their vital concerns to school officials only to have them courteously received, then rationalized and compromised into action."[65]

Minar[66] conducted a study of direct presentation of demands to school boards and administrators. The data was not quantitive, but drawn from interviews with board members, administrators, interested persons in the community, and a content analysis of the local press. Although the population of the study consisted of two high-status, low-participation, suburban communities, the findings appear to apply to other types of school systems.

One of the districts studied was stable, with little community dissent; the other showed a gradual rise in participation and dissent.

---

[64] Richard F. Carter and others, The Structure and Process of School-Community Relations, 5 vols. (Stanford: Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University, 1966); and, Keith Goldhammer, Factors Related to Citizen, Administrator, and Teacher Participation in Educational Decision-Making (Eugene: University of Oregon, 1965).

[65] Amos Wilder, "Client Criticism of Urban Schools: How Valid?" Phi Delta Kappan, LI (November, 1969), p. 129.

[66] David W. Minar, Educational Decision-Making in Suburban Communities, USOE Cooperative Research Project 2440 (Evanston: Northwestern University, 1966).

Minar found that in "low conflict situations the board tends to give the superintendent broad lattitude and to focus its own efforts on community relations questions and on broad matters of educational policies," whereas in high conflict situations the board dealt with questions of detail, and was likely to let the superintendent "front" for it.[67] He also observed that as threats from pressure groups increased board members became less conscious of the limits of the board's capacities.

In a 1964 study of Arizona school districts Dumond[68] concluded that public pressure did influence board of education decisions. However, response was tied directly to the board's perceptions of the demand's legitimate. Dumond also found that lack of communication resulted in greater community pressure. Smoley[69] examined all of the issues considered by the Baltimore Board of School Commissioners from 1953 to 1959. He categorized community groups for analysis and concluded that his "non-school, non-government" category served as a constant check on the board. They objected and complained about various issues forcing the school board to reevaluate some of its actions.

Lyke[70] presented a circular situation as a result of his study of two medium-sized school systems in the East: lack of community support causes the board to doubt a group's representativeness and to break communication with them; seen as a hostile act, the group stages confrontations to build up membership, causing the board more concern, which results in sharper conflict over the next issue. Lyke found that boards of education saw community groups as:

---

[67] David W. Minar, "Community Politics and School Boards," American School Board Journal, CLIV (March, 1967), p. 38.

[68] Jack W. Dumond, "An Analysis of School Board Policy Decisions in Selected Arizona Public School Districts as They Relate to Community Pressure," (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Arizona, 1964).

[69] Eugene R. Smoley, "Community Participation in Urban School Government," (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1965).

[70] Robert F. Lyke, "Representation and Urban School Boards," Community Control of Schools, ed. Henry M. Levin (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1970), p. 150.

1. Making demands, and felt they should bring only complaints and suggestions;

2. Making demands that involved policy changes that board members felt were beyond the board's competence or not adequate to solve the problem;

3. "Irresponsible," meaning that their spokesmen were antagonistic and made unfair demands; and

4. "Illegitimate," since they were all run by outsiders, and professional organizers, and had small, unrepresentative memberships.

While Lyke wrote of the need for increased community participation, he also reasoned that for boards to respond to such groups would be undemocratic, as "it would grant authority to groups that lack legitimacy."[71]

Otis,[72] in a 1966 study reached conclusions that appear at odds with current demands for minority control of the schools. He examined the relationship between social rank and communication about schools, participation in school matters, and approval of school programs. He concluded that persons of higher social rank possessed more and better knowledge of school affairs and expressed more opinions. Approval of the school program was more likely to come from persons of the lower social levels. In a Carnegie Corporation sponsored study on the politics of schools, Bendiner[73] minimized the problem level of community pressure in curricular areas by concluding that "there is nothing new or beyond the ability of a board to handle in its capacity as a local agency." Neither Otis nor Bendiner's observations appear valid when compared with the current situation confronting boards of education.

---

[71] Lyke, p. 150.

[72] John A. Otis, "The Relationship Between Citizen Interest in Schools and Social Rank and Urbanization," (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1966)

One way in which the public schools have provided for community involvement is through the use of lay advisory committees. Such groups, most often formed at the school's discretion and initiative, are of a blue-ribbon make up and so layered with representatives that they are seldom representative. Werle,[74] in a study of eighty-eight districts found that educators placed greatest emphasis on a need for clear understanding of roles and responsibilities whereas laymen expressed more concern for consideration of the issues at hand. Turner[75] suggested that lay advisory boards help a school district gain support but advised that boards of education develop a statement of policies and procedures for such committees.

---

[73] Robert Bendiner, The Politics of Schools: A Crisis in Self-Government (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), p. 39.

[74] Henry D. Werle, "Lay Participation in Curriculum Improvement Programs," (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Columbia University, 1964).

[75] Benton Turner, "Utilization of Large Rural and Suburban Secondary School Sites by School and Community Groups in North Carolina," (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Duke University, 1965).

A development of the past decade of community involvement has been the publication of a number of laymen's guides to effecting change in the schools. Smith, writing under the auspices of the Council for Basic Education took the Council's view that democratic education could only be achieved through the maintenance of high academic standards. Laying no claim to being a revolutionary book, Smith denounced the "pseudo-consensus of group dynamics" and addressed himself "to the unorganized individual citizen who can. . .be quite effective on his own in the matter of school reform."[76]

Lurie took a different approach to promoting change in the schools. Her action-orientated book developed out of what she termed her "battling school bureaucrats for over fifteen years."[77] Lurie explained how to do such things as use state and federal monies in reform efforts, recruit and hire good teachers, get rid of incompetent teachers, principals, and supervisors, improve report cards and homework, use a public hearing for your own purposes, and organize parents to beat the system. Other sources of such advice are Hobson, and Schram.[78]

---

[76] Mortimer Smith, A Citizen's Manual for Public Schools (Boston: Atlantic, Little-Brown, 1959, 1965), p. xii.

[77] Ellen Lurie, How to Change the Schools: A Parent's Handbook on How to Fight the System (New York: Random House Vintage, 1970), p. 3.

[78] Julias W. Jobson, The Damned Children: A Laymen's Guide to Forcing Change in Public Education (Washington: Washington Institute for Quality Education, 1970); and, Barbara A. Schram, Some Basic Guidelines for Building Parent Participation Groups to Effect Changes in the Public School System (New York: Two Bridges Parent Development Program, 1968).

Additional references devoted to community involvement not cited above may prove helpful,[79] as might reviews of the literature.[80]

Federal Role in Community Involvement

In the mid-1960's the federal government became deeply involved in direct intervention in the affairs of the public schools. The 1964 passage of the Economic Opportunity Act "in effect created a new educational system and a new set of agencies for its administration and supervision."[81] The act called for community-action programs to be "developed, conducted and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the area and members of the groups served."[82] Placing the Head Start program out of the hands of the schools was seen as an indication of a genuine lack of confidence,[83] while the Model Cities program was considered as having great potential for increasing community control.[84] Writing for a school board publication, Campbell decried the new federal thrust:. . . "the OEO requirement that there be local participation, even of the poor, in organizing the programs, together with the sensitivity of OEO to political forces, give boards of education new partners and a framework within which decisions are to be made."[85]

---

[79] See: Alan Altshuler, Community Control: The Black Demand for Participation in Large American Cities (New York: Pegasus, 1970); Luvern I. Cunningham, "Trends and Issues in Participation," Emerging Patterns of Administrative Accountability, ed. Lesley H. Browder, Jr. (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1971); Leonard J. Fein, Community Control of the Schools (New York: Pegasus Press, 1970); and Henry B. Hagood, Community Control of the Schools: A New Alternative (Detroit: Michigan-Ohio Regional Educational Laboratory, 1969).

[80] See: Carol Lopate and others, "Decentralization and Community Participation in Public Education," Review of Educational Research XL (February, 1970), pp. 135-150; H. Thomas James, "Politics and Community Decision-Making in Education," RER, XXXVII (October, 1967), pp. 377-386; Theodore J. Jensen and W. Frederick Staub, "School and Community Relations," RER, XXXI (October, 1961), pp. 406-416; and, John D. McNeil, "Forces Influencing Curriculum," RER, XXXIX (June, 1969), pp. 293-318.

[81] Cunningham, "Leadership," p. 190.

[82] Fantini, Gittell, and Magat, p. 299.

[83] Cunningham, "Leadership," p. 190.

[84] Fantini, Gittell, and Magat, p. 299.

Fantini, Gittell, and Magat pointed out that there were some efforts at community control prior to the OEO programs: Saul Alinsky's programs in Chicago and elsewhere, the Mobilization for Youth on New York's Lower East Side, and programs assisted by the Ford Foundation in Oakland, Philadelphia, New Haven, Boston, Pittsburgh, and Washington, D.C. These authors stated however, that "the institution most immune to community action both before and during the early stages of the antipoverty program was the public school system."[86]

In April of 1965 Congress passed, and President Johnson signed, Public Law 89-10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Cunningham wrote that ESEA 1965 has "influenced public school systems and their governing structures more dramatically than any single previous federal action."[87]

Bailey and Mosher[88] compiled a study of the USOE's role in developing and administering ESEA. Their case study spanned two years, spring 1964 to spring 1966. They pointed out a problem that had developed at the local educational agency (LEA) level: the law mandated separate federal agencies to clear with one another in working out programs. Specifically, Section 205 of Title I required that where an area was served by a community action program under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Title I must be developed "in cooperation with the public or private non-profit agency responsible for the community action program."[89] The authors stated that USOE guidelines had not made explicit the roles, responsibilities, and prerogatives of the community groups and the LEA's. There was confusion even to the point that both the community groups and the LEA's thought the community could exercise veto power over proposed Title I projects. The authors did not deal with any community aspects of Title III.

---

[85] Roald F. Campbell, "Federal Impact on Board's Decisions," American School Board Journal, CLIV (March, 1967), p. 42.

[86] Fantini, Gittell, and Magat, pp. 10, 17-18.

[87] Cunningham, "Leadership," p. 187.

[88] Stephen K. Bailey and Edith K. Mosher, ESEA: The Office of Education Administers a Law (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1968).

Bailey and Mosher sampled school superintendents across the nation in reference to the administration of Public Law 89-10. Among the sixty items on the questionnaire, one was directed toward community involvement: "Below are some of the difficulties school districts have encountered with ESEA: coordinating projects with these of the local community action agency." The responses of those who had applied for grants showed that those districts with student populations over 25,000 had a majority "yes" response, and in general, low-income, high-population, urban districts in the Southern and middle-Atlantic areas had such difficulties. It appears that one out of five school districts responding to the questionnaire that had applied for ESEA funds had difficulty coordinating projects with those of the local community action agency. Missing from the description of the study was a definition of the term "difficulty," as well as the number of districts that had such agencies to work with in the first place.[90]

---

[89] Bailey and Mosher, p. 197.

Other studies and histories of Public Law 89-10 had no significant comments on the role of community participation in ESEA.[91]

A study commissioned in 1969 by then Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Robert Finch, examined urban education in order to help the Nixon Administration formulate new legislative and budgetary priorities. Chaired by Dr. Wilson Riles, Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of California, the task force was composed of fifty-nine members drawn from all levels of education as well as various community groups. Among the basic positions taken by a task force was one in strong support of community determination.

Calling for an Urban Education Act, the task force recommended:

> Any new legislation should ensure that the community can develop its own mechanism for significant inclusion; make provision for the training of administrators to accomodate themselves to that mechanism; provide funds for such development and training; and provide for Federal evaluation of institutional change and local evaluation of the mechanism's effectiveness is achieving its objective of increased institutional accountability.[92]

The task force felt that the local advisory boards associated with Title I and Head Start held little promise for effecting institutional change.

---

[90] Bailey and Mosher, p. 282ff.

[91] Eugene Edinberg and Roy D. Morey, An Act of Congress: The Legislative Process and the Making of Education Policy (New York: Norton, 1969); Philip J. Meranto, The Politics of Federal Aid to Education in 1965 (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1967); and, Blaine R. Worthen (ed.), "Title III," Theory into Practice, VI (June, 1967), pp. 101-164.

[92] Riles, p. 340.

It would appear that there has been a direct correlation between federal involvement in public education and community involvement in public education. Campbell pointed out that this federal impact enhanced the decision-making role of the superintendent as opposed to the board, required boards to share their decision-making function, and placed boards "in a position of enforcing federal policies whether or not directly related to education."[93]

EDUCATION OF MEXICAN AMERICANS

Literature dealing with Mexican Americans is seldom dated prior to 1930. Cabrera wrote that the Mexican American's came of bibliographical age in the 1940's, and that few books published since then about multi-ethnic groups had any value for, or were about, Mexican Americans. What pieces did exist consisted of "scattered bits in historical papers, folklore society reports, journals from the social sciences, and occasional articles in newspaper and popular magazines."[94] He is supported in that view by Samora, Alvaren, Galarza[95] and this writer.

Galarza pointed out that particular attention in the studies was given to immigration, education, linguistic problems, farm labor, and religion. He decried the existence of few studies by those with Spanish sur-names: "a recent sampling of 790 published titles of articles, pamphlets, brochures and an occasional book credited 81 entries" to such authors.[96] Alvarez claimed that the major assumption of the social science studies of the Mexican American was that the Mexican American problems were internal. Taking dispute with that, Alvarez charged such studies reduced the concepts to leave the impression that all Mexican Americans were alike.[97]

---

[93] Campbell, p. 42.

[94] Arturo Cabrera, Emerging Faces: The Mexican-American (Dubuque: William C. Brown, 1971), pp. vii, 9.

[95] Julian Samora (ed.), LaRaza: Forgotten Americans (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966); Ernesto Galarza, Herman Gallegos, and Julian Samora, Mexican-Americans in the Southwest (Santa Barbara: McNally and Loftin, 1969, 1970); and, Salvador Alvarez, "Mexican-American Community Organizations," Voices: Readings from El Grito (Berkeley: Quinto Sol Publications, 1971), pp. 91-100.

A somewhat dissenting view concerning the literature was taken by Grebler, Moore, and Guzman. They compiled a massive study of the Mexican American with funds supplied by the Ford Foundation. Their objective was to:

> Present a portrait of the Mexican-American minority in relation to the dominent society that is comprehensive enough in geographic coverage to lift this study from the confines of localism, and inclusive enough in content to articulare interrelationships between such matters as economic status and cultural values, style of life, educational attainment, family structure, or political participation, and between current socio-economic conditions and their historical antecedents.[98]

These authors included a bibliography of over 1,500 items, and pointed out that "contrary to wide spread impressions, a great deal has been written about Mexican-Americans by social scientists."[99] They concluded that much of the literature was local in scope, focused on rural areas, and helped to overemphasize the notion of a highly distinctive population.

---

[96] Galarza, Gallegos, and Samora, p. 55.

[97] Alvarez, p. 91.

[98] Grebler, Moore, and Guzman, p. vi.

[99] Grebler, Moore, and Guzman, p. 6.

Both Grebler, Moore, and Guzman, and Steiner[100] pointed to Carey McWilliams' North from Mexico[101] as an outstanding and thorough study of the social history of the Mexican American. Grebler, Moore, and Guzman saw it as a call for social action while Steiner felt it suffered "from an honest outsider's focus, it was written of the head, not of the heart."[102]

Steiner's book presented a general view of the contemporary Chicano and the brown power movement. The book was divided into four areas: The New Mexico land movement; the California youth movement; la huelga (the strike); and the Crusade for Justice. Steiner's accounts were very personalized, a book of people, a piece of literature, rather than a formal study.

Recent studies and literature dealing with other than education will not be dealt with in this review. However, works by Carranza, Rivera, and Cardova, Heller, and Moore and Cuellar may prove useful to the reader.[103]

General Education Studies

The majority of the books concerning Mexican Americans are in the field of education. Carter has categorized the materials relevant to schools and education into five general types:

---

[100] Stan Steiner, LaRaza: The Mexican-Americans (New York: Harper and Row, 1970).

[101] Carey McWilliams, North From Mexico: The Spanish-Speaking People of the United States (New York: Greenwood Press, 1949, 1968).

[102] Steiner, p. 404.

[103] Elihu Carranza, Feliciano Rivera, and H. L. Cordova, Perspectives in Mexican-American Studies (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971); Celia S. Heller, New Converts to the American Dream: Mobility Aspirations of Young Mexican Americans (New Haven: College and University Press, 1971); and, Joan W. Moore and Alfredo Cueller, Mexican Americans (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1970).

1. Studies of measured achievement and years of schooling;
2. Studies relating socioeconomic factors (and occasionally cultural values and orientations) to achievement and years of schooling;
3. Explanations for these conditions;
4. Papers advocating special programs (some verging on polemics); and
5. Curricular materials.[104]

The literature dealing with the educational conditions, asserted Carter, ascribed Mexican American school failure to factors within their home culture. He related a year long study of the literature which "failed to uncover much written material to enlighten a researcher on the interaction of cause and effect among the three important variables--the school, the community social system, and the Mexican-American sub-cultural group."[105] In any case, the author wrote that the literature did point out that Mexican Americans tended to (1) do poorly in school by any measure; (2) drop out early; (3) speak Spanish; and (4) be poor. Carter's own work was a substudy of Grebler, Moore and Guzman's.

Steiner cited three studies as "basic," and criticized them as not dealing "with the de-education of children whose schooling is aimed at the replacement of LaRaza culture."[106] None of these studies touched upon community involvement in education, with the exception of Manuel, whose sole comment was that the responsibility for good schools started with the community, "first to give high priority to the education of all the children and them to see that the board of education is composed of capable, unselfish, and forward-looking citizens."[107]

---

[104] Thomas P. Carter, Mexican-Americans in School: A History of Educational Neglect (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970), p. 3.

[105] Carter, p. 3.

[106] Steiner, p. 404, cited Charles B. Brussel, Disadvantaged Mexican American Children and Early Educational Experience (Austin: Southwest Educational Development Corporation, 1968); Herschel T. Manuel, Spanish-Speaking Children of the Southwest (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1965); and, George I. Sanchez, Concerning Segregation of Spanish Speaking Children in the Public Schools (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1951).

Writing in 1970 Casso remarked "it is difficult to believe that the Mexican-American quest for quality education began as recently as two years ago."[108] Although his article was directed more toward higher education, Casso made no mention of student or community involvement.

Farias wrote of the need for teachers to understand the ethnic background of their students. He remarked that as more and more Mexican Americans moved into urban areas they faced the problems that characterized urban school systems. He claimed that "parental indifference toward formal education is reflected in their children's academic performance."[109] Ortego, cited a 1968 study by James and Dwight Anderson that concluded that Mexican American children experienced "the same high degree of encouragement and assistance at home as do their classmates."[110] Ortego concluded that the schools were to blame, not the home.

Taylor conducted a study of rural Mexican Americans and Anglos and concluded that the "parents attitudes toward the value of education do not appear to affect the overall academic achievement of the child. . . perhaps the Mexican-American child has been wrongly labeled and is more like the Anglo-American middle-class child in his achievement motivation."[111]

---

[107] Manuel, p. 163.

[108] Henry J. Casso, "Ya Basta, The Siesta is Over," Educating the Mexican American, eds. Henry S. Johnson and William J. Hernandez-M (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1970), pp. 93.

[109] Hector Farias, Jr., "Mexican-American Values and Attitudes Toward Education," Phi Delta Kappan, LII (June, 1971), p. 604.

[110] Ortego, p. 63.

[111] Marie E. Taylor, Educational Cultural Values of Mexican-American Parents: How They Influence the School Achievement of Their Children, (Sacramento: California State Dept. of Education, 1970), p. 8. (Mimeographed.)

Taylor's findings appear especially significant due to the fact that the pupil sample was administered the achievement test battery in English. One can only conjecture at possible higher levels for the Mexican American students had the tests been administered to them in Spanish.

The greatest number of studies of the Mexican American have been oriented toward the rural Southwest and California. There have been few studies that could be termed urban oriented. Samora and Larson conducted a study of a small, isolated Hispano village of twenty-six family units in Northern New Mexico. They studied nine families who moved to Pueblo, Colorado, a city with a population of 100,000 (1961). The authors concluded that migrants did not face serious problems of personal and social adjustment because of the strength of religious and familial organizations, small number of families moving, absence of a physical ghetto, and slowness of the migratory process.[112] The size of the sample limited any generalizations that might have been generated by their suggestive findings.

Samora and Lamanna made a detailed study of the Mexican American in East Chicago. That community was the only Chicano colony outside of the Southwest with a large percentage (11 percent) of the total community population. The researchers found patterns familiar to the Southwest: a young population with a subsequently high dependency ratio, low adult median educational level, poor school performance, and a high drop-out rate. The continuing community factionalism was seen by the researchers as a deterrent to the gain of any power.[113] Colorado University and Matthiasson have conducted similar studies.[114]

---

[112] Julian Samora and Richard F. Larson, "Rural Families in an Urban Setting: A Study in Persistence and Change," Journal of Human Relations, IX (1961), pp. 494-503.

There have been few studies made of the Mexican American population in Toledo, Ohio. Macklin's[115] 1958 study grew out of a workshop in intergroup relations at The University of Toledo. Concluding that little was known about Toledo's Mexican American Community, while half of the workshop's teacher-participants felt their main problems were with such children, Macklin organized a study. The study's universe was 537 households. Interviews were conducted with 120 households, a 22 percent sample. Data on educational concerns was gathered through interviews with teachers of Spanish-speaking children as well as through essays by workshop participants "designed to get at their attitudes about Mexican Americans."[116]

Although the study covered such topics as social characteristics, economic status, employment, and rental prejudice, this review will only summarize the author's conclusions about educational issues in the Toledo Public Schools. Her views were that (1) Mexican American children were being taught by teachers who had very little knowledge of their cultural differences, and had no techniques with which to handle such differences; (2) education was universally valued by the parents; and (3) vocational guidance was lacking. Macklin's recommendations relating to the schools were: (1) teachers should undergo training in courses which deal with the content and techniques for the education of minority group children; (2) home visits by teachers should be conducted for greater understanding as well as better school-community rapport; and, (3) materials to aid the teacher in working with the Mexican American should be developed.[117]

---

[113] Julian Samora and Richard A. Lamanna, Mexican Americans in a Midwest Metropolis: A Study of East Chicago, Mexican American Study Project Advance Report 8 (Los Angeles: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business, University of California, 1967).

[114] See: Colorado University, Institute of Behavioral Sciences, Urbanization of the Migrant (Boulder: University of Colorado Institute of Behavioral Sciences, 1968); and, Carolyn W. Matthiasson, "Acculturation of Mexican-Americans in a Midwestern City," (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Cornell University, 1968).

[115] Barbara June Macklin, "Preliminary Report, Toledo Study, Americans of Mexican Descent," (Toledo, Ohio: Board of Community Relations, 1958), (Mimeographed.)

[116] Macklin, p. 2.

"The Mexican-American community," wrote Macklin, ". . . must work through its own organizations, and as individuals in order to help solve. . . (their) problems."[118] She recommended that parents familiarize themselves with school personnel and school expectations, as well as visit the school before any problems could arise. She also felt that organizations such as the American G.I. Forum, which encouraged Mexican American community participation in education, "could discover where the major problems lie and perhaps program specifically toward them."[119]

While Macklin's techniques and data sources can be questioned as to their validity, her general comments, conclusions and recommendations are of historical value for this dissertation.

Another study of elements of Toledo's Mexican American community was done as a Master's thesis by Bobowski during 1971-72,[120] the purposes of which were cited in Chapter 1 above. Through a process of interviewing selected members of the Community Advisory Council of the Toledo Public Schools' Mexican-American Curriculum Office, Bobowski was able to ferret out two aspects of these selected members that were of interest to the present study: a feeling not only of distrust of the school administrators, but also of being patronized by them, and a disunity and factionism within and among the groups studied.

---

[117] Macklin, pp. 22-24.

[118] Macklin, p. 25.

[119] Macklin, p. 25.

[120] Ed Bobowski, "An Examination of Educational Attitudes of Selected Mexican American Leaders in Toledo," (unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Toledo, 1972).

Church[121] conducted a study with Mexican American students in the Toledo Public Schools that attempted to determine whether bilingualism was a factor that affected aspirations and attitudes toward school and the educational process. She concluded that little evidence existed to prove that bilingual students had more emotional and social problems than monolingual students.

In recent years various federal agencies and departments such as the National Advisory Committee on Mexican American Education, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, the Mexican Affairs Unit of the USOE, and the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish Speaking People have been formed. These organizations have published general reports, testimony before hearings, and bibliographies, all dealing with the education of the Mexican American.[122] Also see Brace and others.[123]

---

[121] Virginia Church, "A Comparative Study of the Attitudes and Aspirations of Bilingual Mexican American Students with Monolingual Mexican American Students," (unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Toledo, 1971).

[122] See: National Advisory Committee on Mexican American Education, The Mexican-American: Quest for Equality (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968); U.S., Commission on Civil Rights, Stranger in One's Land (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1970); U.S., Office of Education, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, Mexican American Affairs Unit, Mexican-American Education: A Special Report (Washington: USOE, March, 1968); and, Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish Speaking People, The Spanish Speaking in the United States: A Guide to Materials (Washington: The Committee, 1971).

[123] U.S., Office of Education, Federal Programs to Improve Mexican

Community Involvement

In a 1954 analysis of Mexican American leadership in a bi-cultural community, Watson and Samora[124] pointed out that such leadership was inadequate. Among their reasons was the rationale that many of the Spanish goals and values were similiar to those of the Anglo culture and thus leaders needed to be well adjusted to and familiar with the Anglo culture. They then pointed out that those leaders who met such qualifications were looked upon with suspicion by other Mexican Americans, who would accuse them of selling out to the Anglo. This led to division in the community, which the authors claimed was the largest factor in limiting the political power of the Mexican American.

Grebler, Moore, and Guzman wrote that most often, Mexican American leaders were recruited by Anglos. They found that many Mexican Americans, suspicious of their leaders sincereity, begrudged them success. A story attributed to Mexican American activists was quoted by the authors: "If a Mexican and an Anglo were both trying to climb greased poles with prizes at the top, the Anglos would clap when the Anglo reached the top, but when the Mexican got near the prize the Mexicans would pull the fellow down by his breeches."[125]

Grebler, Moore, and Guzman also found that Mexican American leaders were highly individualistic, competitive, and hostile to one another. They saw as a main problem the fact that leaders had "to have dual validation by the ethnic clientele and the dominent system."[126]

American Education, (by Clayton Brace and others), (Washington: USOE, 1967).

[124] James B. Watson and Julian Samora, "Subordinate Leadership in a Bicultural Community: An Analysis," American Sociological Review, XIX (August, 1954), pp. 413-421.

[125] Grebler, Moore, and Guzman, p. 552.

[126] Grebler, Moore, and Guzman, p. 552.

In a study of the Mexican American community of East Los Angeles, Sheldon concluded that "there exist a few seemingly viable organizations whose members tend to shift their loyalties from one group to another, but no organization. . .has yet demonstrated the ability to speak for any sizeable proportion of the Mexican-American population."[127] The same comment would appear to be appropriate for Anglo and black groups as well. Sheldon also found that multiple memberships produced a situation in which a rather small number of people swelled the rolls of many groups. This he said, presented a confusing picture to a larger community.

Briegle's research on Mexican American organizations led her to conclude that "the large numbers of organizations and their fluid condition are factors in their failure to fulfill their social and political goals."[128] A Texas study on party politics stated that when Mexican Americans were organized and free to express themselves they were liberal in outlook and more concerned with civil rights than economic programs.[129]

Galaraza, Gallegos, and Samora summarized the character of most Mexican American organizations formed since World War Two as focused on neighborhood improvement, protest against police brutality and harrassment, election reforms, citizenship and naturalization, and funeral insurance protection. They claimed that recent activities by Mexican American groups refuted a number of cliches, such as their having no will to resist economic mistreatment or social discrimination, no capacity to organize, and few leaders. The authors also felt that when considered for public boards, Mexican Americans were judged by standards not applied to Anglos, such as being too middle class or over identified with Mexican causes.[130]

---

[127] Paul M. Sheldon, "Community Participation and the Emerging Middle Class," Samora, 145.

[128] Kaye Briegel, "The Development of Mexican-American Organizations," The Mexican Americans: An Awakening Minority, ed. Manuel P. Servin (Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1970), p. 161.

[129] James R. Soukup, Party and Fractional Divisions in Texas (Ausgin: University of Texas Press, 1964).

Alvarez disputed community studies such as Sheldon's above, for typifying Mexican Americans as divided and unorganized. "The significance of the formal organizations," he wrote, "has all too often been studied from the standpoint of external criteria and there has yet to be compiled a study that focuses upon the criteria as viewed by the memberships."[131] The author specifically took issue with such ideas as their being no history of Mexican Americans organizing or even knowing how to organize, and the concept that they are just now awakening, emerging, or asserting themselves.

Citing such groups as the United Mexican American Students, Mexican American Student Association, and Brown Berets, Ericksen wrote that "the main meat on which activists feed is the educational establishment."[132] At the first National Chicano Youth Liberation Conference (1969) the platform called for community control of the schools in somewhat general terms, while the Oakland Area _La Raza Unida_ Party platform stated that "the community should have control of the entire educational system from the nursery school through college. . .(with) democratic elections of community control boards to supervise our schools within our communities."[133] (Also see Vidal.[134])

---

[130] Galarza, Gallegos, and Samora, pp. 49-52.

[131] Alvarez, p. 98.

[132] Charles A. Ericksen, "Uprising in the Barrios," Johnson and Hernandez-M, pp. 58-59.

A number of writers have pointed out that Mexican Americans have not found the Parent Teacher Associations to be of help to their community, considering them to be a part of the power structure.[135] Ortego[136] called for the development of special programs which Mexican Americans could control, while Farias felt "the federal government should pay Mexican American parents to attend sessions where they become involved with schools.'[137] The Los Angeles Board of Education created a Mexican-American Education Commission to act as a spokesman for their sizeable population.[138]

Testifying before the Cabinet Committee hearings on Mexican American Affairs in 1967, Moreno proposed that programs funded under federal titles be reviewed with the Association of Mexican American Educators as to what role the community played in the development of the programs. "An otherwise effective program," said Moreno, "prepared by experts with positive intentions, may fail because the participants do not appreciate the necessity, reliance, or importance of it."[139] Rodriquez asserted that "the focus of the federal government is sharp and is getting sharper every day" with regard to community involvement of minority groups in educational planning. "If education is the main vehicle for social and economic mobility, the community must assert its needs for membership in the policy levels of administration of public education."[140]

---

[133] Antonio Camejo (ed.), Documents of the Chicano Struggle (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1971), pp. 4, 11-12.

[134] Mirta Vidal, Chicano Liberation and Revolutionary Youth (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1971).

[135] Carter, p. 136, and, National Education Association, The Spanish-Speaking Child in the Schools of the Southwest (Washington: NEA, 1966), p. 5.

[136] Ortego, p. 81.

[137] Farias, p. 604.

[138] Educational Research Service, p. 23.

SUMMARY

The review of the literature has led this writer to conclude the following with reference to material concerning community involvement in educational decision-making and the education status of the Mexican American.

Studies of community power structures consisted primarily of pre-1965 research that dealt with multiple-elites while neglecting the aspect of minority group noninvolvement. Decentralization literature centered around proposals for action, descriptions of operation, and comments upon its merits and disadvantages. Community involvement materials were composed of articles decrying the bureaucracy of the schools, describing the New York City school issues, and individual as well as organizational position statements. Literature that dealt with the federal aspect of the topic described program requirements for community involvement and recommendations made by individuals and organizations for continued involvement.

---

[139] Edward V. Moreno, "Elementary and Secondary Education," Johnson and Hernandez-M, pp. 26-27.

[140] Armando Rodriquez, "How Sharp the Focus?" Johnson and Hernandez-M, p. 308

Studies of the educational status of the Mexican American focused primarily upon the rural Southwestern states and California. They generally concentrated on achievement and years of schooling as well as the related casual socioeconomic factors. Much of the literature consisted of articles that could be considered polemical in nature. The literature concerning the community involvement tendencies of Mexican Americans was composed of studies tracing the history of voluntary organizations, and those calling for increased community participation, especially in education.

The community involvement experiences of the school system involved in this study, prior to working with the Mexican American community, will be described in the following chapter

Chapter 3

BACKGROUND OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE EDUCATIONAL COMMUNITY

INTRODUCTION

The involvement of various decision-makers of the Toledo Public Schools with several specific elements of Toledo's Mexican American community should be studied in the light of other community involvement activities of the school system. This chapter will examine those exchanges between the school system and numerous elements of the community that developed as a result of federal and state program requirements as well as the school system's self-initiated community involvement programs.

DESCRIPTION OF THE CITY AND THE SCHOOL SYSTEM

The fourth largest city in Ohio, Toledo had a 1970 population of 383,818. The city has encountered the general types of problems that have plagued most American urban centers in the latter half of the 1960's: decreasing revenue with rising costs, an outwardly mobile white population, suburban shopping centers acting as economic magnets, fluctuating racial tensions, and a brush with an overflow of the 1967 Detroit riot.

Although Toledo has benefited during this period from a relatively stable economic and employment situation, aftershocks of Detroit automobile problems or gains are felt throughout the city. Commercial, industrial, and residential building is on the rise, as is tonnage shipped through its port facilities.

The Toledo Public Schools have also encountered the general types of problems that have plagued most American urban school systems in the latter half of the 1960's: decreasing revenue with rising costs, a teacher's strike, periodic racial flare-ups, and an austerity program. At the same time, however, fiscal limitations placed upon expenditures, a curtailment on hiring, and increased state aid kept the system in a comparatively better financial posture as contrasted with a number of other Ohio school districts, both larger and smaller.

The civil rights report submitted by the system to the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in October 1970 showed a total student population in sixty-three regular elementary schools, nine district high schools, and two vocational high schools of 61,717.[1] Fulltime classroom teachers numbered 2,457.[2] Per pupil expenditure for 1969-70 was $774.35.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT WITH FEDERAL PROGRAMS

The school system's earliest experiences with community involvement came in response to federal requirements, especially in Titles I and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Title I, ESEA, Advisory Councils

"I have determined that parental involvement at the local level is important in increasing the effectiveness of programs under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act."[3] With that October 1970 statement by the Acting U.S. Commissioner of Education, USOE regulations required school districts to establish a system wide council of parents of children in Title I programs. This requirement was one in a series of USOE guidelines issued to carry out the provisions of the ESEA Amendments of 1970 (P.L. 91-230) as they applied to aid to disadvantaged school children.

---

[1] American Indian 53; black 16,423; Oriental 100; Spanish American 1,635; other 43,506.

[2] American Indian 0; black 429; Oriental 6; Spanish American 5; other 2,017.

An early issue in the degree of community involvement found such groups as the National Education Association, American Association of School Administrators, and the Council of Chief State School Officers opposed to requiring parent councils in each Title I school. Groups such as the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools, and the National Welfare Rights Organization argued for such representation. The final federal guidelines represented a compromise between these two viewpoints. They required one parent council for each school district rather than one for each school. The guidelines did not specify how the council was to be set up.[4]

The new guidelines strengthened earlier USOE comments on parental involvement that such councils "will need to be established" and that "it will be advantageous for a local educational agency to establish a local advisory committee."[5]

---

[3] T. H. Bell, Acting U.S. Commissioner of Education, to Chief State School Officers, October 30, 1970.

[4] National School Public Relations Association, Washington Monitor, November 9, 1970.

[5] Harold Howe II, U.S. Commissioner of Education, to Chief State School Officers, July 2, 1968, and July 19, 1968.

The Ohio Department of Education produced a Handbook on Parent Councils that warned against "paper" or "figurehead" councils. The handbook pointed out that "it must be clearly stated, for all to understand, that neither the federal regulations give to the parent council under Title I the right to approve projects or to veto projects approved by appropriate school personnel."[6]

The Toledo Public Schools exceeded the federal regulations and established parent councils in each Title I school attendance area by January 1971. These local councils were composed of thirteen members: five parents of children eligible for Title I services, one parent from a non-public school, one parent-aide, two teachers, the principal, and three at-large representatives from neighborhood-based organizations. The selection process for the advisory council originated with the principal, who chose the first two parents, with these two members and the principal chosing the remaining members. One parent member was then elected to represent that council on the system-wide council.

The system-wide council had forty-seven members, representing twenty-six schools and numerous community groups, as well as principals. No teacher representation was built into the district-wide council. School personnel were to preside at all meetings, as well as prepare the agendas. Both levels of councils were reminded by the administration of their advisory nature, and the general intent of the objectives clearly followed this level of involvement.

In order to form the councils, the administration mailed letters to 3,599 parents; 412 answered, with 230 agreeing to serve on the parent advisory councils. One school had twenty-four parents eligible to serve, two responded. One mother then came to the meeting, the second mother resigned. The Title I staff then began knocking on doors, 439 of them. The parents were not quite certain of the purpose of Title I, much less advisory councils. Thus the councils were slowly formed throughout the winter and spring of 1970-71.[7]

---

[6] Ohio Department of Education, Title I, ESEA, Handbook on Parent Councils. (Draft) (Columbus: Ohio Department of Education, n.d.) (Mimeographed.)

It appears that with the exception of a normal amount of parental interest in school affairs, the community embracing the Toledo Title I schools evidenced little interest in advising the schools. The federal and state guidelines led the system into creating a parent advisory council system, as well as generating the interest in such a system.

The federal guidelines that grew out of P.L. 89-10, Title III, Section 304 (a) stated that in planning eligible programs, evidence had to be presented that there had been "participation of persons broadly representative of the cultural and educational resources of the area to be served."[8] USOE's suggestions as to types of groups to include were non-public schools, educational laboratories and R and D Centers, libraries, museums, musical and artistic organizations, educational radio and TV stations, private foundations, community youth organizations, technical institutes, private industry, professional associations, community action agencies, and other cultural and educational resources.[9]

---

[7] The Blade (Toledo), June 27, 1971.

[8] U.S. Congress, The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title III, Section 304 (a), Public Law 89-10, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, H.R. 12161. (April 11, 1965).

[9] Bailey and Mosher, p. 198.

Rather than advising on any form of control by a portion of a community, these guidelines were in the form of requiring inter-agency cooperation and relations. The law required such consultation in the planning stages only, and did not call for the establishment of permanent advisory councils.

Title III, ESEA, Projects

The Toledo schools had five Title III projects prior to the funding of the Mexican American Curriculum Office project.[10] Each of these projects, with various funding periods ranging from 1966 through 1971, had advisory councils with at least three things in common: they were comprised of leaders from the business and professional community (as opposed to clients and consumers), they met infrequently or not at all, and they had no functions that could be associated with power. According to the guidelines as quoted above, the school systems had more than met the requirements for community involvement.

An appropriate case in point was the advisory council involvement of one of these Title III projects, the Afro-American Curriculum Office. This three year project, first funded in the summer of 1970, grew out of a general concern held by the administration and prompted by segments of the black community concerning the absence of black history, culture, and contributions from the curriculum. The project was designed to correct this situation, as well as promote better human relations through the establishment of a resource center, production of curriculum units, and conducting staff development activities. Much of what came to be in the Mexican American Curriculum Office had its origins in this Title III project.

---

[10] The projects were: Children's Assessment Placement Instruction Center, Chinese-Russian Center, King School Multi-Unit Project, Afro-American Curriculum Office, and the Family Learning Center.

At a luncheon given by the school system for selected community representatives, the projected goals and organization of the Afro-American project were explained. This was a one-way dissemination effort on the part of the system, which took place at a point well along in the planning for the grant. Those invited to the meeting were the Model Cities Agency, Chamber of Commerce, Public Library, The University of Toledo, Harambee, NAACP, Catholic Diocese, World Affairs Council, and the International Institute. A minimum feedback resulted from this group of six whites and three blacks.

During the first two years of the project, the membership of the advisory council was expanded to include representatives from other black groups. However, this advisory council never held a meeting. As peculiar as that may seem, this ambiguity is overshadowed by the fact that there was never any request by any of the members to hold a meeting. In essence it was a paper council, and more a group of names on a mailing list than a community based council designed to advise the project. Once more, however, the federal and state requirements were met.

Model Cities

Under the Department of Housing and Urban Development, through the Toledo City Demonstration Agency (Model Cities) the school system became a contractor to perform certain educational functions in Model Cities qualified schools. The Model City Neighborhood was the lowest economic section of the central city. This program was a composite plan for raising the quality of all facets of urban living: housing, employment, education, recreation, criminal justice, health, transportation, welfare, and social services.

Eleven elementary schools and one high school attendance districts or portions of districts fell within the boundaries of the Model Cities area. Residents of each of these school districts elected representatives to a Model Neighborhood Residents Association (MNRA). A sub-committee of MNRA, the Educational Function Committee, assessed the educational needs of the neighborhood residents. The original (1970-71) problem list contained thirteen items.

1. Academic underachievement in school.

2. Lack of purpose, motivation and definite goals: academic or vocational.

3. Curriculum is inflexible and too restricted.

4. Lack of opportunity for student participation in school affairs (high school).

5. Lack of parent and community participation in school activities.

6. Insufficient staffing of schools with able, concerned, and understanding teachers and administrators.

7. Lack of knowledge of and pride in the contributions made by Afro-Americans.

8. Inadequate counseling services (K-12).

9. Inadequate nutrition programs and food services.

10. Lack of early identification of physical and mental health problems, and inadequate referrals procedures and follow-up.

11. Lack of opportunities for able learners and those with special talents to advance at rates comparable to their maximum potential.

12. Insufficient library facilities and materials in the home, the neighborhood, and school.

13. Adult education needs: consumer knowledge and legal rights and responsibilities.

These problems were brought to the attention of the MNRA, who choose to contract with the Toledo Public Schools to develop and carry out programs to meet these needs. Education appeared uppermost in the minds of the MNRA, as they allocated $900,000 to the school system--the largest share of the Model Cities budget.

In order to coordinate the needs with the program, the MNRA together with the schools created a position of Coordinator of the Toledo Public Schools Model Cities Educational Projects. The Coordinator was chosen in January 1970 from among three names submitted to the Board of Education by a community and school personnel committee. The board thus retained the ultimate power of deciding upon personnel. Community involvement in this instance was evident in the development of a needs list, contracting for services, allocating monies, and recommending personnel. An additional tie with the school system was the locating of the Coordinator's office at the central administration building of the board of education.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT WITH LOCALLY INITIATED PROJECTS

Not all of the school system's work with community adivsory councils was the result of complying with federal or state program requirements. Its involvement in a program designed to promote better human relations among students, staff, and community as well as a massive effort at a study of the system's needs for the 1970's were both generated out of the Toledo community, with the latter a definite school administration idea.

Human Relations Department

Since 1946 Toledo has had an organization devoted to promoting racial harmony, the Board of Community Relations. In late 1969, the BCR made a recommendation that the Board of Education create a Human Relations program in the school system. In January 1970, the Board of Education did so, forming a community advisory committee and agreeing that a director of the program would be appointed by the BCR and the Board of Education. The Superintendent of Schools recommended however, that in the final analysis the director be appointed by the Board of Education and the program administered by the school system.

The advisory committee was composed of representatives from numerous city-wide as well as neighborhood groups. They were the Toledo PTA Council, Board of Community Relations, Black Pride, Harrambee, Toledo Education Association, Toledo Federation of Teachers, Police Department Human Relations Bureau, NAACP, Council of Churches, Junior League, League of Women Voters, Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance, Guadalupe Center, and school administrators.

Within two months, representatives of the advisory committee were before the Board of Education asking for a clarification of their role. Their spokesman claimed the committee was being shaped as a rubber stamp and "constantly reminded of the administration's right to its own decision, and the committee has been scolded for conducting its own meetings."[11] The Superintendent replied that the role of the committee included such things as determining the frequency of meetings, number and selection of committee members, students to benefit from the program, adult guidance of the program, achievement of program goals, strengths, weaknesses, and future of the program. The Superintendent concluded his remarks by stating that "selection of personnel is a major function which should never be taken from the administration."[12]

---

[11] The Blade (Toledo), March 31, 1970.

The basic argument was over the salary of the director, with the administration holding out for approximately two thousand dollars less than the advisory committee's demand. This matter of salary contained the two basic elements of control which the school system would not relinquish, budget control and final selection of personnel. In August of 1970, eight months after the position was created, it was filled by a local black pastor and director of an OEO Opportunity Center.

Study for the Seventies

At a Board of Education meeting in March of 1969, the Superintendent of Schools made known his desire to form a citizen's committee to study the schools. He spoke of a group representative of various interests and segments of the city. Within weeks such a group was organized, which led into a two year study that apparently resulted in a few discernible changes in the school system and many hours of tension between certain community members and school administrators. The effort was known as "The Study for the Seventies."

A month after the Superintendent's suggestion, the Board of Community Relations recommended to him that a permanent citizen's advisory committee on education be formed. Such a group, said the BCR, should be permanent, comprised of representatives from community organizations, and should provide an outside, and therefore, presumably natural study of the system.

---

[12] The Blade (Toledo), March 31, 1970.

The same month, April of 1969, the school administration hosted a one day meeting of 130 community people to decide what should be studied and how. Near the end of the day a determined effort was made by some community members to have the group elect a steering committee to serve as a permanent advisory body of the Board of Education. The major effort toward this end was led by an Episcopalian minister serving with a community social action group, the Toledo Metropolitan Mission. This pastor was later elected chairman of the City-Wide Committee of the Study for the Seventies.

Voicing concern that such a permanent committee might not prove representative, the Superintendent successfully headed off all efforts to perpetuate any portion of the one day effort.[13] The creation of a steering committee at this point was apparently seen by the administration as too confining for what they wanted to work into at their own speed and with their own guidelines.

The May Board of Education meeting saw the administration given the go-ahead to plan for a citizen's committee. In July, the committee plan was approved by the Board of Education. It called for a council of twenty-five citizens to be formed in every elementary school district, and a council of thirty-six in each high school district.

Each elementary principal was to form a committee of five including not more than two representing PTA or Mother's Clubs, the principal, one teacher, and one citizen-at-large who was to be a non-parent of the school. This committee of fifteen was to then select ten more people from a list of those indicating an interest in participating.

---

[13] The Blade (Toledo), April 23, 1969.

Each high school principal was to form a committee in much the same way. The high school committee included students and non-teaching personnel as well.

The City-Wide Committee was to be composed of fifty-five members including three representatives from each of the ten high school area advisory councils and representatives from a list of twenty-four community and school employee organizations. Two black community groups were on the list, however, no Mexican American group was included. The structure of the committees resulted in a membership of over 2000 citizens.

When school opened in the fall of 1969, principals were told to begin forming their committees, with November 14 the deadline for reporting the names of committee members to central administration. As the committees were being formed, the administration reiterated the principles to guide the study:

> 1. The study is desired by the Board of Education and the final decision as to the form and use of this study will rest with this legally responsible body.
>
> 2. The entire staff of the Toledo Public Schools and all its physical facilities will be included.
>
> 3. The resources of the entire community will be utilized in the study--citizens and community groups and agencies will be involved and kept informed of the study and its progress.
>
> 4. The needs of the community at large will be considered.
>
> 5. Pertinent documents and information will be made available.[14]

---

[14] Lee R. McMurrin, "A Study for the Seventies," Administrative Bulletin, Toledo Public Schools, October, 1969 (Mimeographed).

The timeline of the study called for the final report to be submitted to the Board of Education in December 1970. An eight day teacher's strike in September, 1970, contributed to the delay in the final reporting until April, 1971.

The first efforts of the overall study were concentrated in obtaining a needs list from all of the elementary and high school committees. Upon receiving these needs assessments, the City-Wide Committee was to examine them within its sub-committees of Administration and Organization, Building and Facilities, Curriculum, Finance, Health Services, Human Relations, Personnel, Public Relations, Pupil Services and Special Education, and Student Affairs.

By March, fifty-nine of the sixty-five elementary school committees had submitted a combined 1,271 problems ranging from the need for better lighting in cloakrooms to changing the tax structure. These problems were consolidated into 148 basic problems, with frequencies ranging from one to twenty-nine Number one, with a frequency of twenty-nine, concerned discipline and respect for authority. Concern with a lack of community involvement was mentioned by twenty-three committees, ranking sixth.

The committees did not seem to evidence much awareness of, or concern with, minority problems. A need for intercultural education ranked eighty-third with a frequency of three, as did mention of a swimming pool, planning time for teachers, and foreign language in elementary schools. Requests for Negro History came from two schools, as did a desire for expanded English classes for non-English families.

The ten high school committees reported in March also. The number one concern, with all but one committee mentioning it, was a request for better maintenance and a modernization of the high school buildings. Better communication between school and parents and more parent involvement ranked eleventh, having been mentioned by four committees.

Committees from three high schools which could be considered as transitional in racial population listed a need for better human relations and communication. Toledo's only all black high school called for the right to develop the kind of plans necessary to meet their needs. This was categorized in the compilation under "Miscellaneous Local Problems." The high school committees submitted 255 problems, many of them the same. The number of problems submitted per school ranged from eight to eighty.

It is difficult to properly weigh the value of these concerns as reported by the high school and elementary committees, as the rank order was based upon frequency of being listed, not on some method of point value or priority ranking. However, it may at least be implied that the areas of community involvement and minority relations did not fare as well as budgets and buildings.

Although the composition of the City-Wide Committee was designed to be almost equally divided between representatives of the high school districts and various community organizations, the organization-orientated members soon took charge of the committee. As the study for the Seventies Project Administrator stated, the power plays tended to alienate the parent representatives from the high school districts.[15] Thus the City-Wide Committee tended to include the subjects of community involvement and minority relations in its own problem list more often than did the other committees. Of the sixty-seven problems identified by the City-Wide Committee, four dealt directly with increased community involvement, three with minority relations and curriculum.

---

[15] Statement by Robert Roman, personal interview, May 3, 1972.

At the first meeting of the City-Wide Committee, the issue of its power was among the first things to be discussed. A representative of the League of Women Voters said that it was her understanding that the Board of Education would abide by the committee's decisions and that the community should have the freedom of investigation. The Superintendent stated that while the Board was genuine in its desire to have the viewpoints of the citizens, the committee had no legal power. "The influence of the committee will be the depth of the report it submits."[16]

The second meeting was full of the continuing issue of power. The Superintendent voiced the fear that "a few aggressive individuals or organizations. . . (would seize) complete authority and control of the committee."[17] Slowly but quite steadily the meetings evolved into long sessions of parliamentary squabbles. The committee's official size was fifty-five, but as the months ground on, the attendance figures wore down also: 50, 49, 41, 32, 28, 20. Numerous meetings were held without a quorum of members present.

The Toledo _Blade_ in a December 1970 editorial charged that the study "continues to drift along in aimless fashion" with "less and less. . . heard of general school needs and more and more of special projects favored by some organization."[18] One week later, at a Board of Education meeting, the Deputy Superintendent commented that "grand standing and parliamentary procedure should not be allowed to stand in the way" of the committee.[19] The Project Administrator reported to the Board that it was doubtful that the committee would achieve the desired goals under its existing structure. "It appears," he wrote, "that the general progress which has been made is being clouded by individuals with particular interests with which they are more concerned than with the growth of the total school system and the community."[20]

---

[16] Minutes of the City-Wide Committee, Study for the Seventies, Toledo Public Schools, March 9, 1970. (Mimeographed.) Hereafter cited as City-Wide Minutes.

[17] City-Wide Minutes, April 3, 1970.

The chairman of the committee charged that the study was floundering because of non-cooperation by the school system's administration. Another member termed the administration's policy as one of benign neglect.[21]

In an attempt to neutralize the dissidents on the committee, the administration placed additional people on the City-Wide Committee. This improved attendance at the meetings, but little other evidence of progress toward final reports was apparent. A small group of members would not allow the study to come to a close in the spring of 1971 as the Board timeline required.

The chairman called for the Board of Education to hire consultants to finish up the study. He argued that such persons would be able "to ask hard questions, free of political involvement, not under the threat of losing his job if he raises hard questions."[22]

---

[18] Editorial, The Blade (Toledo), December 12, 1970.

[19] The Blade (Toledo), December 18, 1970.

[20] Minutes of the Board of Education, Toledo City School District, December 17, 1970, p. 41a. Hereafter cited as Board of Education Minutes.

[21] City-Wide Minutes, (Executive Committee), November 16, 1970.

[22] City-Wide Minutes, April 5, 1971.

The Project Administrator reacted to the growing call for outside consultants in a memo to the administration by asking: "Can a school board legally discharge its responsibility to a group of citizens, who are attempting to set themselves up as an ad hoc board of education, by providing them with outside consultants?" The Board of Education agreed with his recommendation that the sub-committees had to submit reports by no later than April 30, 1971.

The reports came in. There were no more meetings of the City-Wide Committee. The professional staff was no longer available. The Toledo Blade remarked that the committees' recommendations were expected to die but that it was "unlikely any will mourn the passing" of the Study of the Seventies.[23]

It appears that the tasks of the committees were painted in too broad strokes. The sub-committees found themselves sitting and waiting while the participants in the City-Wide Committee power struggle continued to perpetuate parliamentary procedural roadblocks. The community organizations were more organized and purposeful and gained control of almost all aspects of the study, while parents and other concerned citizens slowly dropped off committees due to frustration and a growing apathy. The system's administrators were not used to revealing information and regarded many requests as just plain snooping. In a number of cases, the information requested was not even organized in a form to be released. When compared with the man hours and resources poured into the study by the system and the community, the study's positive results were far outweighed by negative ones.

---

[23] Editorial, The Blade (Toledo), July 13, 1971.

SUMMARY

Since 1965, the Toledo Public Schools had an increasing number of contacts with various segments of the local community which resulted in different types of community involvement. Where federal or state guidelines required advisory councils, the school system met and oftentimes exceeded the program requirements. It appears that the administration did not view these advisory councils as threatening, for the program requirements always stopped short of allowing the community any real power, i.e. budget and hiring control.

Where no guidelines existed, the administration found itself in more trouble with various community groups. The lack of guidelines or at least the lack of agreement on guidelines seemed to stimulate some community groups to reach out for power. The administration found itself being denounced as seeking rubber stamp committees as opposed to those having a form of meaningful power.

The lack of any Board of Education formal policy on the role of community advisory councils forced the administration to spend a great amount of time heading off power maneuvers. It appears that the two main issues on which the administration could stand the most firm were budget and hiring powers. In these two instances, state law did not allow delegation of these important powers.

In the following chapter, the Mexican American community's prior experiences in community involvement activities will be examined.

Chapter 4

BACKGROUND OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE MEXICAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY

INTRODUCTION

In order to draw inferences concerning the community involvement activities of several specific elements of Toledo's Mexican American community prior to their confrontations with the school system, a description of the community in general, the specific groups, and their activities will be presented in this chapter.

DESCRIPTION OF THE MEXICAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY

Galarza has pointed out that although the great majority of the Mexican Americans life in the Southwest, the remaining 15 to 20 percent "are concentrated in such midwestern and eastern urban centers as Kansas City, Chicago Heights, the South Chicago - East Chicago - Gary complex, Lansing, Saginaw, Detroit, Toledo, and Washington, D.C."[1] Toledo and the surrounding counties that make up Northwest Ohio are near the end of a migrant stream that follows the emerging crops from Texas up through Arkansas and Illinois to Ohio and Michigan. In Northwest Ohio the migrant farm workers help in the spring cultivation of tomatoes, sugar beets, and pickles. In July, when cherries are ripe they go to

---

[1] Galarza, Gallegos, and Samora, p. viii.

Michigan, returning to the Toledo area in August and September to harvest or process fruit, beans, pickles, cabbage, and tomatoes. At the first killing frost many migrants make their way back to Texas to await another season.[2]

Not all of the migrants return to their Texas home base however. Increasingly, they are dropping out of the migrant stream and settling out in Michigan and Ohio. It has been estimated that by the end of 1972 there will be no need for any migrant labor in all of Michigan. This will be due to increased automation and advanced horticultural technology.[3] With Ohio second only to Michigan in its use of migrant labor,[4] and with Northwest Ohio as the last area in the stream, it appears as if the area will undergo a rapid increase in the number of settled-out migrants making it their permanent home.

Actual numbers of Mexican Americans in the migrant stream are difficult to determine. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has attributed this fact to (1) the isolation and wanderings of the migrants, (2) farm labor reports not being accurate because there are tax incentives for the farmers to make low estimates, and (3) constant moving has disenfranchised many migrants, hence they are not covered by State welfare laws, resulting in few records.[5]

---

[2] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Children at the Crossroads, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1970), p. 9; and, Ohio Department of Education, Toward a New Horizon: Migrant Education Programs in the State of Ohio, (Columbus: Department of Education, 1970).

[3] Jess Walker, "Migration Toward Education," Ohio Department of Education, Ohio Conference on Migrant Education (Columbus: Department of Education, 1968).

[4] Children at the Crossroads, p. 9.

[5] Children at the Crossroads, p. 3.

In 1940 the Ohio State Employment Service estimated that 2,600 migrants from Texas went to the sugar beet fields in Ohio.[6] Various sources[7] estimated the number of migrants working in Ohio at the peak of the 1966 through 1970 seasons as ranging from 22,000 to 25,000. Such figures represent the workers only, not their families who, however, often work in the fields also. Northwest Ohio receives 85 to 95 percent of all Ohio migrants.[8] Grebler, Moore, and Guzman have generalized that between 1950 and 1960 Mexican Americans urbanized more rapidly than Anglos or non-whites. It can only be inferred from this limited data that the Toledo area Mexican American population is increasing and will continue to do so.

Written evidence of the presence of the Mexican American in Toledo does not appear to exist prior to 1920. A clipping of that year related that the YMCA was conducting "Toledo Americanization Work" with migrants located at camps in the Middle Grounds and in East Toledo. Classes were conducted for the migrants in Household arts and English.[10] A series of government contracts for easing the World War Two railroad workers shortage brought a number of Mexican Americans to Toledo, with the last such contract expiring in December, 1945. At that time it was estimated that there were 500 Mexican Americans in Toledo.[11] The 1958 Macklin study reviewed in Chapter Two above, estimated that two to three thousand Mexican Americans were permanent residents residents of the city.

---

[7] Governor's Committee on Migrant Labor, Migratory Labor in Ohio, (Columbus: Ohio Department of Industrial Relations, 1966), p. 13; Toward a New Horizon; Rev. Robert Haas to Bishop John A. Donovan, September 3, 1969.

[8] Governor's Committee on Migrant Labor, p. 15.

[9] Grebler, Moore, and Guzman, p. 112.

[10] Bobowski, p. 24.

Reliable information concerning the actual number of Mexican Americans in the city of Toledo is almost nonexistent. The U.S. Department of Commerce's Bureau of Census did not consider the Mexican American as a significant minority in the Toledo area. Therefore, in the general 1970 census, those Toledoans designating themselves as Mexican American were counted as Caucasian.[12]

The Economic Opportunity Planning Association of Toledo (EOPA) performed a Spanish surname survey in 1972. Taking into consideration the problems associated with surveys,[13] their final total, after multiplying the number of family units by 4.77,[14] was 8,687.[15] According to Grebler, Moore, and Guzman some analysts add ten percent to cover the undernumeration of Mexican Americans.[16] Following this practice it may be estimated that the Mexican American population of Toledo is 9,555.

---

[11] The Times (Toledo), September 1, 1945, September 9, 1945.

[12] J. Byron Jenson, Spanish Surname Families in the City of Toledo, (Toledo: Economic Opportunity Planning Association, 1971), p. 1. (Mimeographed.)

[13] For criticisms of the Spanish surname census method see Grebler, Moore, and Guzman, pp. 601-604; and, R. F. Valdez, "The Fallacy of the Spanish Surname Survey," Journal of the California Teachers Association, LXV, No. 3, (May, 1969), pp. 29-32.

[14] According to the 1960 U.S. Census of Population 4.77 was the average family size for Spanish surname persons in Southwest United States.

[15] Jenson, p. 4.

[16] Grebler, Moore, and Guzman, p. 603.

This figure is considerably lower than the generally accepted conjectures which range from twelve to fourteen thousand.

The EOPA study was broken down by census tracts, which indicated that the Mexican American population in Toledo is spread into three rather distinct areas of the city: (1) north from the fringe of the core of the city in a corridor along the Maumee River; (2) south in much the same manner; and, (3) on the east side of the river.[17] Given the information that only five families of Mexican descent have been identified in the Model Cities area,[18] the lowest economic section of the city, it may be inferred that the housing pattern described above does not represent one or more barrios.[19] Rather, it represents a spread-out pattern with no single area designated as the Mexican American section of the city. Public and non-public Mexican American students in these three areas in 1971 totaled 1,380 (north 398, south 560, and east 422).[20]

MEXICAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

The Community Advisory Council that was eventually organized as a part of the process of developing the formal proposal for a Mexican American Curriculum Office was composed primarily of representatives of various Mexican American community groups and their allies. The Mexican

---

[17] Jenson, p. 6.

[18] The Blade (Toledo), September 14, 1972.

[19] A neighborhood of Mexican Americans. Poverty is implied but not implicit in the use of the term.

[20] Toledo Public Schools, Formal Proposal: Mexican-American Curriculum Office, submitted for funding under ESEA Title III, Section 306, to USOE, May 20, 1971, p. 14. (Mimeographed.)

American community groups will be described in this section with their allied agencies considered in the next. The Guadalupe Center will be discussed later in the chapter.

La Raza Unida

In June, 1969, twenty-one months after the first national efforts at organizing began, the Ohio Chapter of La Raza Unida was founded. Since that time, twenty-two local chapters have been organized--Toledo's in August, 1970.

The stated purposes of the organization are:[21]

"1. To unite into an association in the State of Ohio all civic, social, cultural, religious, and political groups of persons of La Raza;

2. To provide a medium whereby collective and individual interests can be safeguarded and advanced by public discussion and united action on matters concerning the benefits and betterment of La Raza;

3. To contribute to the growth and influence the promotion of equality of justice;

4. To develop unity and cohension among La Raza; and

5. To cooperate with any segment of society who, like ourselves, have the best interests in mind for the community and state in realizing the right of human dignity for every American citizen."

Using funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity as well as from church donations, La Raza Unida is unique in that it is made up of not only Mexican Americans but Puerto Ricans in the Cleveland and Lorain areas.[22] Eight areas of prime interest to the organization are:

---

[21] Bobowski, pp. 44-45.

[22] Statement by Celso Rodriquez, personal interview, February 29, 1972.

employment, civil rights, education, church relations, welfare, health, farm labor and housing.[23] A typical activity of the organization is to locate housing and employment for settled out migrants. The variety of sources for their funding apparently allows the group a degree of flexibility in their activities.

Although La Raza Unida is intended to be a solidarity movement, and was frequently mentioned in this writer's interviews as one of Toledo's two leading Mexican American groups--along with the Farm Labor Organizing Committee--it does not appear to have the political ambitions of its counterpart chapters in the Southwest United States.

Los Latinos Unidos

Los Latinos Unidos is considered to be the first Mexican American group organized in the Toledo area.[24] Its origin was as the advisory council of Our Lady of Guadalupe Church, which by 1931 had become the migrant's parish. When the church closed, the building became a social service center. The group became the advisory council of this Guadalupe Center when it began operation with Office of Economic Opportunity funds in 1966. The organization was later voted out in a disputed election discussed later in this chapter.

Los Latinos Unidos is often seen as the public relations spokesman for the Mexican American community, however, it functions primarily as a social club for Mexican American men. A former field representative for La Raza Unida characterized Los Latinos Unidas as not really doing very much in the community in terms of dealing with social issues. "The way they help," he said, "is to make contributions to the Guadalupe Center. . .or some family badly needs help they give them a contribution to get back to Texas."[25]

---

[23] The Blade (Toledo), August 3, 1970.

[24] John Soto, "Northwestern Ohio Chicano Power Movement," (unpublished paper, The University of Toledo, August, 1971), p. 27.

The group does not appear to desire to get back into community politics. A seat on the MACO Advisory Council reserved for Los Latinos Unidos remained empty throughout the planning and development of the project. Their importance for this study lies in their prior role with the Guadalupe Center.

Farm Labor Organizing Committee

The one group given more credit by those interviewed than any other for bringing the Toledo area Mexican American community to life politically was the Farm Labor Organizing Committee (FLOC). This union was first organized in 1967 in Ottawa, Ohio. According to its constitution, the general purpose and function of FLOC is to

> Form and comprise a union of people to work for the betterment of farm workers and former farm workers and especially all those persons whose lives and fortunes have been adversely affected by involvement, whether directly or indirectly, in the so-called "Migrant Stream," and all other persons, regardless of race, color, creed or place of national origin, for whom circumstances of prejudices, bigotry, racial discrimination, special covenants, environment or an accident of birth has meant exclusion from full enjoyment of the social, cultural, economic and political rights implied in and intrinsic to the phrase, "Pursuit of Happiness."

Membership in FLOC is open to migrants of any race and "under conditions to be determined by the elected officials of FLOC, certain non-migrants who have demonstrated their friendship for and support of migrants and the goals of this organization, and any such group of workers and disadvantaged persons as FLOC shall deem eligible for membership."[26] In a letter to the Superintendent of Schools, the President of FLOC claimed to "represent over 3,000 members--more Mexican-Americans than any other organization in Toledo."[27]

---

[25] Celso Rodriquez to Larson.

FLOC began organizing the migrants in the rural counties of Henry, Hancock, Putnam, Wood, Ottawa, and portions of Lucas. They met strong resistance from the growers. At the peak of the 1968 growing season, FLOC struck a number of growers who would not sign recognition agreements with the union. The issues eventually went to mediation, with twenty-two contracts signed in 1968 and eleven in the summer of 1969.

According to one Mexican American community leader, FLOC brought about an awareness on the part of the Anglos that "there are Chicanos here and whether or not you like it, you are going to have to deal with us." However, he felt that as a pressure group FLOC "started flexing their muscles in a little too early; when they started to organize the farm workers the organization wasn't strong enough to do a good job." No one followed up the contracts to see if the farmers honored the contracts, consequently the second year they had to go through the same process all over again.[28]

---

[26] "Constitution and By-Laws of the Farm Labor Organizing Committee," p. 4.

[27] Baldemar Velasquez to Frank Dick, April 15, 1970.

[28] Statements by Sylvester Duran in interview with Bobowski, July 7, 1971.

The organization began to concentrate less in the rural areas and consequently the struggle came closer to Toledo. Soto has characterized the reasons for this shift in direction, both ideological and geographic, as: (1) the Office of Economic Opportunity was more receptive to the goals and objectives of FLOC; (2) there was a larger following in Toledo; (3) the bulk of the organizers were from Toledo; and (4) the area was not farmer oriented or controlled.[29]

In order to start some economic enterprises, FLOC sought financial support from the Office of Economic Opportunity. The fact that they were a labor group would not permit OEO funding, thus was born the Migrant Community Development Corporation (MCDC). The MCDC operates a gasoline co-op and a food co-op. The Executive Director of EOPA, Toledo's anti-poverty agency, has claimed that the food co-op is failing, remarking that "they don't take advice too easily."[30]

The President of FLOC, Baldemar Velasquez, stated "we're not paying lip service to anybody for the sake of getting funds. When we start organizing in the city we are stepping into alot of these other people's fields. All these agencies are extremely paternalistic. Our function is to confront these same ideas and wrong values in our own community--the same ideas as the fascist Anglos. When something is wrong we feel it should be confronted right out in the open."[31] It is this aspect of FLOC--confronting the Mexican American community as well as the Anglo establishment--that has caused it to become the controversial organization it is.

---

[29] Soto, pp. 19-20.

[30] Statements by Wayman Palmer in interview with Bobowski, August 9, 1971.

[31] Statements by Baldemar Velasquez in interview with Bobowski, August 14, 1971.

The EOPA Executive Director claimed that FLOC's "whole being, its whole credibility was Rudy Lira. When Baldy (Baldemar Velasquez) came into Northwest Ohio with the idea of FLOC, it was Rudy that sold it to the people." Palmer related that in the winter of 1969-70 Cesar Chavez attended a mass meeting at the Guadalupe Center. "Baldy walked in," he recalled, "he gets a good round of applause. Rudy walks in, he gets a standing ovation. Cesar walks in, he gets a good healthy round of applause."[32]

The split of Lira from FLOC appears to be representative of the split between FLOC and the larger Mexican American community. Now Director of Migrant Affairs for EOPA, Lira felt that those people with college degrees--referring to the FLOC leadership--"went so far out that they left us behind and they were alone."[33] These thoughts were echoed by another Mexican American who said that FLOC "didn't consider the forty or forty-two year old man. . .can't get him overnight,"[34] another remarked that FLOC's change in direction when they started "saying they were pro-Che, Marx, Lenin, and Mao turned off a lot of people. FLOC died you might say as an organization when they took and moved in that direction."[35]

Velasquez did not agree. "Movements tend to get out of control," he said, "and tend to get nationalistic, provincial. This leads to a very emotional type of involvement, then to a very anti-intellectual situation. It is not what we are trying to get Chicanos out of but what we are trying to get Chicanos into: a change in the mentality and methods of the leadership of the Mexican American community. Leaders are going to have to stop fearing losing the legitimacy of their leadership. When you are a leader you have to lead them into thinking about things they have not thought of before. There is a lot of racism in the Mexican American community against blacks. We have confronted the community about racism against blacks; about the superstitious relation with the Catholic church."[36]

---

[32] Palmer to Bobowski.

[33] Statement by Rudy Lira in interview with Bobowski, July 7, 1971.

[34] S. Duran to Bobowski.

[35] Statement by Celso Rodriquez in interview with Bobowski, July 8, 1971.

Claiming that Mexican American leaders have come to him and admitted that FLOC's ideas are good, but that the people do not understand them, Velasquez said that "the only way you are really going to make them understand is to keep talking those ideas and wait for them to come up on your level."[37]

Questioned about Lira's leaving FLOC, Velasquez denied an ideological split. He alluded to home pressures and that "we were confronting alot of citizens of Toledo who used to tell Rudy what a great guy he was, who used to go and worship on his doorstep every Friday and Saturday." The President of FLOC claimed that OEO, the Federal Government, they all wish that FLOC were dead. "I think," he said, "FLOC is more alive than any other Mexican American organization."[38] Other segments of the Mexican American community do not agree.

Brown Berets of Northwest Ohio

The President of FLOC claimed that in order to get Mexican American youth to combat the same issues of authoritarianism, racism, and the church that FLOC was attempting to have the adult community deal with, he organized the Brown Berets of Northwest Ohio.[39] This split over the purposes and intent of the Brown Berets has clouded the organization to such a degree that not much is really known about its makeup and organization, even within the Mexican American community.

---

[36] Statements by Baldemar Velasquez, personal interview, February 28, 1972.

[37] Velasquez to Larson.

[38] Velasqez to Bobowski.

It is known that Velasquez is no longer connected with the organization. The leader of this youth group is Moises Pacheco, who with his sister Alicia, were involved in the formation of the Brown Berets in January, 1970. According to Moises Pacheco, the aim of the organization is to end poverty as a way of life in the Mexican American community and to gain representation for the Mexican American people, "both politically and in the power structure of the city."[41]

Soto described the group as "little more than a sophisticated gang that had social motives for change."[42] At first all areas of the city were represented in the group, however the membership soon dropped to those in North Toledo. Velasquez stated that he has "never seen more than eight or nine of them at the same time anywhere."[43] Another Mexican American characterized the group as like mosquitos: "they are all over the place, flying around, biting, really not sticking to any one thing and following through."[44] It appears that the Brown Berets are not connected with their namesake national organization, are small in number, and revolve around one family in North Toledo.

---

[39] Velasquez to Larson.

[40] Statement by John Garcia, personal interview, March 17, 1972.

[41] The Blade (Toledo), July 19, 1970.

[42] Soto, p. 23.

[43] Velasquez to Larson.

[44] C. Rodriquez to Bobowski.

North Toledo Area Corridor Area Corporation

The North Toledo Area Corridor Area Corporation grew out of a number of community groups operating in that section of the city. Active in these small groups were community organizers working out of the Toledo Metropolitan Mission (TMM), a department of the Toledo Area Council of Churches. The impetus for the formation of the corporation was an impending grant from the American Lutheran Church which had to go to an incorporated agency.[45]

The staff of the TMM and the groups with which they were working organized a board of trustees. Each organization named two trustees to the board, all from the neighborhood. The men from the TMM organized a leadership training program which grew into an educational task force. It was this task force that first confronted the Board of Education concerning the need for better education of Mexican Americans. This development is described in the following chapter.

ALLIED COMMUNITY AGENCIES

The groups described below were involved in the MACO Community Advisory Council, but are not considered as Mexican American community organizations. Representatives from these agencies either sat on the council, acted as supportive organizers, or provided legal advice to the council.

Migrant Division, Economic Opportunity Planning Association of Greater Toledo

EOPA, a branch of the federal Office of Economic Opportunity, was incorporated in April, 1965. Considered the city's anti-poverty agency, it was not until a combination of a poor growing season and a new Executive Director brought about increased attention to the plight of the migrant worker, that a Migrant Division was established. This division, under the directorship of Rudy Lira, was organized in the summer of 1969. It operates a migrant Head Start program, a Day Care Center, offers legal advice, aids in family planning, and generally serves as a liaison with other agencies.

---

[45] Statements by Chester Chambers, personal interview, August 29, 1972.

The Executive Director of EOPA stated that Lira's being a part of the agency was at least partially political. "For the image of the agency I wanted somebody to serve a role to keep us sensitized, alert--so we are in fact responding properly. Rudy is the best one-to-one social worker in the United States."[46]

Department for the Spanish Speaking of the Office of Community Relations, Catholic Diocese of Toledo

Established in June, 1968, the Office of Community Relations of the Toledo Diocese was designed to:

1. Relate the resources of the Roman Catholic Church to the needs of the community, especially in the areas of poverty, race, labor, peace, and drug abuse;

2. Cause the Church to change in order to be an effective agent of change in correcting traditional and continuing injustices to the disadvantaged and to minorities;

3. Develop the Office of Community Relations into an effective and professional agent of social change.

---

[46] Palmer to Bobowski.

The Department for the Spanish-speaking, under Sylvester Duran, was organized to become involved in, and assist with, anything that had to do with the Spanish-speaking. They aided in the sponsorship of a Leadership Training Program at Bowling Green State University and two other Northwest Ohio colleges. The program was to build leadership potential through development of an appreciation of ethnic origins and history. The department also works with volunteers helping settled-out migrants.[47]

Toledo Metropolitan Mission

The Toledo Metropolitan Mission (TMM) is a semiautonomous department of the Toledo Area Council of Churches. Its funding comes from nine denominational jurisdictional units and national denominational grants. Thus, it is not funded by local churches. Four church groups (United Methodist, American Lutheran, Episcopal, and Roman Catholic) each loan a staff man to work under a full-time director, Rev. Claude Kilgore. The members of the staff are responsible to their own department in program and policy matters and to the Toledo Area Council of Churches Director in administrative matters.[48]

---

[47] Statements by Sylvester Duran, personal interview, February 23, 1972.

[48] Chambers to Larson.

For the year 1971-72 TMM had three goals with numerous attendant objectives, strategies, and next steps:[49]

> Goal A: To be an agent of structural change in enabling major metropolitan systems to meet and respond more effectively to un-met needs of disadvantaged people in housing, education, welfare, employment, recreation, health, law enforcement, government and other appropriate areas.
>
> Goal B: To enable disadvantaged groups in metropolitan Toledo to participate more effectively in the determination of community policy, program practice, and decision-making that affect their lives.
>
> Goal C: To cause the Institutional church to be responsible as an agent of change to social action needs of disadvantaged people.

Within these goals were set forth a number of specific objectives and strategies which dealt with the school system, Mexican Americans, or a combination of the two, such as to support citizens "seeking to make Toledo Public Schools more responsive to their constituency." This objective was to be carried out by continued action training of organizational representatives, assisting the MACO Advisory Council, and working with Advocates for Basic Legal Equality (ABLE) in tracking Title I funds.

Another objective was to "assist Northwest Neighborhood and Community Development Corporation and constituent neighborhood councils in achieving community control of programs in their area (e.g., schools, mental health, etc.)" The "empowerment of Mexican-Americans" was to be accomplished through action training sessions.[50]

---

[49] Toledo Metropolitan Mission, "Objectives, Strategy, and Next Steps for 1971-72," October 21, 1971. (Mimeographed.)

[50] TMM, p. 3.

The staff of the TMM does not see themselves in the role of professional community organizers. "We are a step back from that," stated one of the staff, Chester Chambers. "We are not really that involved in terms of direct organizing."[51] While at least two members of the MACO Advisory Council who were interviewed made specific favorable comments concerning Chambers' openness and expertise,[52] a Mexican American teacher member remarked that "he pushes Mexican Americans into situations where it benefits (the TMM). . .he controls Pacheco and the Brown Berets like a puppet."[53]

Advocates for Basic Legal Equality

The Advocates for Basic Legal Equality (ABLE) are a group of young lawyers working in the relatively new field of poverty law. ABLE seeks to bring about constructive law reform through test court cases and provides group representation. It does not work with individuals as such, except where such a case will become a test case in the areas of tenant rights, public housing, urban renewal, consumer rights, prisoner's rights, equal opportunity employment rights, and the rights of foreign speaking persons.

One of the ABLE lawyers explained their role "as a traditional lawyer-client thing--almost a mouthpiece thing. . .helping them to articulate things, we consider ourselves as advisers. . .really, no one comes to me if they have power."[54]

---

[51] Chambers to Larson.

[52] Velasquez to Larson; S. Duran to Larson.

[53] Statement by Ricardo Cervantes, personal interview, February 24, 1972.

[54] Statements by John Harris, personal interview, September 7, 1972.

ABLE receives funds from the Economic Opportunity Planning Association as well as direct support from the Offic of Economic Opportunity. The Toledo Metropolitan Mission, with whom ABLE worked in tracking Title I funds in the Toledo Public Schools, has as one of their objectives, to "assist in seeking continued funding for ABLE."[55]

MEXICAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Two controversies occurred within the Mexican American community prior to the formation of MACO which had an influence on the manner in which the elements represented in the MACO Advisory Council carried out their activities. An examination of these two prolonged incidents is necessary for that reason, as well as for the light it can shed on the way in which these segments of the Mexican American community interacted with one another prior to MACO. The two situations were the arguments concerning an attempt by FLOC to take over a Diocesan camp in Luna Pier, Michigan, and the issue of the control of the Guadalupe Center.

Luna Pier

Since the 1930's the Catholic Diocese of Toledo had operated a summer camp for orphans in Luna Pier, Michigan. Known as Camp Lady of the Lake, it had more recently been owned and operated by Catholic Charities as a day camp. FLOC saw what it considered to be a better use for the camp: a center for recently settled-out migrants. Thus, in June of 1969, FLOC led approximately forty migrants in an occupation of the camp.

---

[55] TMM, p. 2.

Immediate opposition to this occupation came from officials of the city of Luna Pier. They stated that year-round use of the camp would violate city building, zoning, and health laws. Their estimate of the cost of renovations necessary to meet local ordinance requirements was $500,000. In addition, they threatened to sue both FLOC and Catholic Charities for failure to evacuate the camp.

Catholic Charities did not want to acquiesce to the demands of FLOC, which now included being given the money necessary to reconstruct the camp to Luna Pier specifications. Catholic Charities widened the issue by approaching the state organization of La Raza Unida with the proposal that they take over the operation of the camp. As a Brown Beret observed, "the Church had already come out and said it wasn't going to support FLOC in any way."[56] Pleading a lack of funds, La Raza Unida decided that it did not wish to be used as a buffer between FLOC and the church.[57]

Catholic Charities next obtained a license from the Agriculture Department of the State of Michigan permitting nonconforming use of the camp as a migrant center until October, 1969. Luna Pier officials then began to go through with their earlier threat of a civil suit, now based on the grounds that the city's zoning ordinances took precedence over the state permit. At this point, faced with what they saw as a losing battle, Catholic Charities demanded that FLOC vacate Camp Lady of the Lake.[58] FLOC held out over the summer, but eventually gave up and abandoned the camp. Catholic Charities then proceeded to sell the camp to business interests unconnected with migrants or the Mexican American community.

---

[56] Statement by Moises Pacheco in interview with Bobowski, July 6, 1971.

[57] The Blade (Toledo), July 31, 1969.

"They ought to give us the camp," charged the FLOC president. "Here we are, committing our life to the project, working without pay, and the church looked at it as a business transaction."[59] The Director of the Guadalupe Center recalled that although "we know that the church hasn't done too much; most people repudiated FLOC when they were acting against the church. Now I don't think we were right. We lost a good opportunity for getting a good piece of land for our people."[60]

Guadalupe Center

By the 1930's, Our Lady of Guadalupe Church had become known as the migrant's parish. The church itself merged with another parish in late 1962; however, the buildings became an opportunity center in 1966. The Guadalupe Center, as it became known, received its funding through the Economic Opportunity Planning Association and was operated through the Toledo Diocesan Opportunities Commission. The activities of the center focused upon services such as adult basic education classes, driver training, health counseling and income tax return preparation.

Although the power for operating the center was to be in the hands of the people, the Diocese appointed the sixteen-member Advisory Council. This council was essentially the same council that had been the advisors of the original church, and were known as Los Latinos Unidos. In December, 1969, FLOC began to demand that the advisory council become more representative by being selected in a community-wide election. In a long and hotly disputed election on January 11, 1970, FLOC representatives captured eleven of the sixteen seats.

---

[59] Velasquez to Larson.

[60] Statement by Ysidro Durin in interview with Bobowski, July 6, 1971.

Within a month, the director of the center, Joseph O'Brien, announced his intention to resign as of May. FLOC seized this opportunity to challenge the Toledo Diocesan Opportunities Commission's right to appoint a new director. The TDOC had this right under their contract with EOPA. FLOC pushed for a community election for director--an act which did not have the official sanction of the Diocese. The election resulted in a FLOC victory when their candidate, Manuel Caro, defeated Rudy Lira, 144 to 112.

Shortly before O'Brien was to resign, a group challenged the validity of the January 11, 1970, Advisory Council election, and elected a rival council. A petition was forwarded to the TDOC on May 8, 1970, demanding that the January Advisory Council be abolished and a new one formed, claiming the present council "was not representative of the best interests of the Mexican American community in the area." The shadow advisory council claimed "that the election took place by a show of hands, and that out-of-town supporters from as far as Celina voted in the election."[61]

Within a few days, the TDOC, on May 18, 1970, after interviewing eight applicants for the directorship, including Caro, appointed

---

[61] The Catholic Chronicle (Toledo), May 8, 1970.

Ysidro Duran. The Toledo Blade, under the heading "Nonmilitant New Head of Guadalupe Center," quoted Duran as saying, "I have one aim, and that is to improve the lot of Mexican Americans. Militants have nothing to contribute to the solution of our problems." A recently laid-off factory worker, Duran was an organizer and former president of Los Latinos Unidos. His brother, Sylvester, Director of the Department for the Spanish Speaking of the Diocese, was the President of La Raza Unida, while another brother, Sesario, was treasurer of FLOC. FLOC repudiated the appointment, stating that TDOC was "ignoring the poeple's voice" and proceeded to picket EOPA and the residence of the Bishop.[62]

Throughout the remainder of the year the new director was faced with working with competing advisory councils. In December, 1970, EOPA changed policy, and pointing out that the TDOC represented "an unnecessary middle layer," began to operate the center directly through the Advisory Council. The Diocese was now out of the picture. The same month, a new Advisory Council was elected at the now annual election.

As the Director of EOPA recalled, "almost at the first meeting the far right captured control of the council. They were more vocal, more informed, and overpowered the rest of them. They are running the show which I feel is almost an equal disaster with what had gone on before. . .John Garcia was elected chairman--very institution orientated. He called the very next day and said, I'm really going to show those people how to do things." I said, "wait a minute, don't you mean my people?"[63]

---

[62] The Blade (Toledo), May 18, 1970.

[63] Palmer to Bobowski.

Seven months later, August, 1971, the Advisory Council asked EOPA to fire the director of the center, Ysidro Duran. He was fired for alleged failure to control the center's budget and to recognize and work with the Advisory Council. In response, Duran claimed of receiving incomplete financial reports from EOPA and charged the council with interfering with the daily operations of the center.[64]

FLOC now reversed their original May, 1970 stand against Duran and picketed the Guadalupe Center in a show of support for the ousted director. A FLOC spokesman said that the issue was the same as before--community control of the center. FLOC called for, and held, an unofficial recall election of the Advisory Council on October 3, 1971. Baldemar Velasquez, FLOC president, became chairman of the unrecognized council.[65] The annual election came off in December with predictable problems; a new advisory council was formed, and Duran was ultimately reinstated.

As Velasquez recalled the original January, 1970, election for this writer, he said, "before FLOC started raising hell around there it was a dead place. We crashed it with a couple hundred people and the Guadalupe Center has never been the same again."[66]

SUMMARY

The Mexican American population of Toledo was formed over the past sixty years by an increasing number of farm laborers and their families reaching the decision to break out of the cycle of the migrant

---

[64] Y. Duran to Bobowski.

[65] The Blade (Toledo), September 16, 1971, November 11, 1971.

[66] Velasquez to Larson.

stream. What a great many of these settled-out migrants encountered was that the move from field work to looking for work in the urban center did not break their poverty cycle. With few exceptions, the Anglo and black segments did not have a full realization of the presence of this disadvantaged minority, much less an understanding of their plight.

A further complication was the status or class separation that developed between those Mexican Americans who felt that they had made it, as compared with the recent--i.e., two or more seasons--settled-out families. The final distinction between the two is broken when the settled-out farm laborer obtains full-time employment. This community fragmentation is apparent when one examines the types of Mexican American community organizations operating in Toledo. The positions become even more clear when the groups come into conflict situations among themselves.

It was out of the fields of Northwest Ohio that the first ripples of organized protests against the establishment, in this case the growers, began to occur. The activities of the Farm Labor Organizing Committee pulled together hundreds of migrant workers in an attempt at union recognition, better wages, and better living conditions. For reasons stated earlier in the chapter, FLOC appeared to retreat to the city. It had become, in effect, a "settled-out" organization. It sought legitimacy and support from the more established Mexican American. This support, however, was to be on FLOC's terms, which were the proper attitude against the church, racism, and authoritarianism in the home.

What must be considered as the more conservative groups, La Raza Unida, Los Latinos Unidos, and the Guadalupe Center Advisory Council under John Garcia, reacted negatively to the FLOC positions and attitudes. The Luna Pier and Guadelupe Center issues, while they evidenced disunity and infighting, also had the effect of pushing the community toward increased involvement and a realization of the potential power of La Raza.

It is naive to talk of the formation of a "representative" Mexican American group with which establishment agencies could negotiate. However, with the organizing and supportive activities of agencies such as the Toledo Metropolitan Mission and Advocates for Basic Legal Equality, certain elements of the Mexican American community were prepared to confront the educational establishment. It is this development that will be discussed in the following chapter.

Chapter 5

THE MEXICAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY'S BEGINNING INVOLVEMENT WITH THE SCHOOL SYSTEM

INTRODUCTION

Over the period of a year, certain specific elements of the Mexican American community confronted the Board of Education with deamnds for a series of curricular and administrative reforms. These demands, and the school system's responses, will be examined in this chapter, for they eventually led to the Mexican-American Curriculum Office. All of these incidents took place prior to the eventual joint planning for MACO.

COMMUNITY PRESSURE IS APPLIED

In the last few months of 1969, the administration of the Toledo Public Schools, especially the Social Studies Department and the Deputy Superintendent, were preparing one draft after another of a proposal to be submitted to the Ohio State Department of Education. The proposal called for the establishment of an Afro-American Curriculum Office.[1] As the staff went through the series of revisions, there evolved a concept of a chain of specialized curriculum offices. The school system already had a Title III, ESEA, project, The Chinese-Russian

---

[1] The curriculum office was funded for three years beginning in June, 1970.

Study Center, and these early drafts showed the Chinese-Russian, proposed Afro-American, and a proposed third specialized curriculum office gathered under an Intercultural Studies Department. The third center was labeled "Latin American Curriculum Office--For Future Development." The State Department of Education did not wish to spend money on the development of a total department, just on the Afro-American portion; the school system agreed that they only wanted an Afro-American Office at that time, and thus the Intercultural Studies Department position was dropped from the proposal. However, when the final proposal was accepted by the State Department of Education, the organizational chart remained unchanged; a Latin American Curriculum Office--For Future Development--was included.[2] The reasons for the use of the term Latin American are unclear; however, elements of the Mexican American community, unaware of the proposal, soon aided the administration in narrowing their focus to the problems of the Mexican American.

In January, 1970, staff members of the Toledo Metropolitan Mission were active in working with residents of an area of Toledo known as the North Toledo corridor area. Within this unofficial corridor area there lived a large concentration of Mexican Americans. There were a number of small community organizations operating in the area: the Northwest Opportunity Center, an adult drop-in center known as Crossroads, a clothing swap shop, and an informal youth center. The general problems of inadequate housing, unemployment, heavily travelled streets, and a large urban high school all demanded the attention of aware residents. The staff of the TMM wanted to organize the residents of the area to confront those agencies the community felt were responsible for the problems.

---

[2] Toledo Public Schools, Initial Proposal: Afro-American Curriculum Office. Submitted for funding under ESEA Title III, Toledo: Toledo Public Schools, February 25, 1970), p. 31. (Mimeographed.)

Organizing efforts took money, and a grant was obtained from the American Lutheran Church. Because the grant could only be funded through an incorporated agency, steps were taken to form representatives of the various community organizations into the North Toledo Corridor Area Corporation. Each organization named two trustees to the board. Both of these trustees had to be from the neighborhood; in the case of the representatives from the funding agency, only one had to be from the neighborhood.

The TMM staff had undergone an action training program the fall before with professional action trainers from Cleveland which had focused on education. Action training is a leadership development and problem solving technique in which the goals established by the group are to be accomplished by identifying one's resources and the steps necessary to accomplish the goals. A staff member of the TMM remarked that they had started nine such action training groups and that every one had produced some results.

One of the nine was connected with the school system's Study for the Seventies, in which a TMM staff member became the chairman of the City-Wide Committee. Success in this case was the impasse which developed. According to the TMM staff member, "if one assumes the purpose for the Study for the Seventies, at least from the administration's point of view, was to legitimize a bond issue, it stopped that. . .it may have helped defeat a bond issue."[3]

---

[3] Chambers to Larson.

The TMM wanted to put the members of the North Toledo Corridor Area Corporation through an action training program. At their organizational meeting, a number of Brown Berets showed up. They were not interested in just talking academically about action training, and the group broke down into small groups to discuss possible problem areas that could be confronted. Three of the four groups reported back with concerns about Woodward High School. The two basic concerns were an absence of Mexican American counselors as well as an absence of Mexican American history. Thus, the Education Task Force of the North Toledo Corridor Area Corporation was formed.

The Task Force began to meet for about four hours every Saturday. Most of the youth dropped out of the sessions. Two who stayed in, a brother and sister, Moises and Alicia Pacheco, "sold essentially a Chicano goal to the group."[4] The action training process pushed the group back to really finding out what the problem was that they wanted to work on. It was a process of doing research and reporting back to the group: what were the educational problems of the Mexican American? The group discovered that two other high schools--Waite and Libbey--had more Mexican American students, thus the Task Force had to broaden its goals.

One of the goals which caused the group to seriously consider and reconsider their position concerned the need for seven sensitive Mexican American counselors. The issue of having to make their goals realistic, forced them to call for fully certified counselors, or persons in a similar functioning position--para-professionals.

The Brown Berets were still impatient, and proceeded to precipitate a crisis by presenting a list of demands to the principal of Woodward

---

[4] Chambers to Larson.

High School. Recalled a TMM staff member, this "really shook things up pretty badly. . .and this they did on their own with no knowledge on our part. That caused a lot of flack, there began to be a lot of suspicion and rumors about what we were all about, so that is what really prompted us to surface and go to the board."[5]

At the regular monthly meeting of the Toledo Board of Education, in March, 1970, Rev. Chester Chambers and Alicia Pacheco made a presentation to the board. Chambers urged that the board employ "as soon as possible seven sensitive Mexican-American counselors (or persons in a similar functioning position) in the elementary and high schools with the highest Mexican-American student concentration this fall."[6] (This request, if granted, would have doubled the number of Mexican American certified personnel in the school system.)

The TMM staff member presented three reasons for this request: (1) In addition to a bi-lingual problem Mexican Americans have faced many of the same kinds of discrimination as have blacks; (2) the community population was increasing, and such personnel as Mexican American counselors were needed to develop an ethnic identity within the school system with this minority group; and (3) although no figures were available, it appeared that the drop-out rate of Mexican American students was high.

A Woodward High School student and member of the Brown Berets, Alicia Pacheco, spoke next. She reinforced the desire for Mexican American counselors as well as for a study of Mexican American history.

---

[5] Chambers to Larson.

[6] All statements made by representatives of the community were also presented in writing to the board. Information for this presentation and others to follow were taken from these hand-outs.

She did not request a separate course approach. Chambers closed the presentation by remarking that "we are in the process of gathering data on ways in which other progressive school systems are meeting the needs of Mexican Americans, as well as discussing our concerns with other groups in the community." He asked for a preliminary response to the requests by the next meeting.

A reaction to the presentation came to the Superintendent in the form of a letter from the Lagrange Business and Professional Men's Association. They wrote, in part,

> It is our feeling that such demands work against the American concept of Public Schools and do nothing but polarize the community. Woodward High School is comprised of many ethnic groups, who under normal conditions, free from agitation and pressure groups, live, work, and study well together. We want to preserve and improve this American concept of free education for all who desire to work for it. We also feel that giving in to these demands will bring about further pressures from other ethnic groups.[7]

To this writer's knowledge, the above counter pressure was the only written expression of opposition to the Mexican American demands from outside the Mexican American community throughout the period under study. It can be assumed, however, that there were a number of informal and verbal expressions of concern. In general, there was very little public opposition or protest to any of the negotiations the school system held with segments of the Mexican American community.

At the April Board of Education meeting, the Assistant Superintendent presented a response to the request made the previous month.[8] He opened the report by recognizing the problems facing the Mexican

---

[7] John Syroka to Frank Dick, April 14, 1970.

[8] Toledo Public Schools, Office of Urban Affairs, "Response to Mexican-American Request," April 27, 1970.

American, and pointed out that education was just one of them. Then followed a series of statements concerning expected revisions in the social studies curriculum which would include "a fair and balanced view of the contributions of all segments of American life." These particular comments had been prepared by the Director of Social Studies some weeks prior in response to expressed concerns from some elements of the black community. Although they did represent the thinking of the administration on needed changes in the curriculum, they were not written specifically in response to the Mexican American requests.

Listing six schools where Mexican American aides were employees, the Assistant Superintendent said "we want to urge any person or organization aware of fully qualified people of Spanish origin who have bi-lingual and bi-cultural skills and background to make application" for teaching, counseling, and aide positions.

Alicia Pacheco made another presentation at this board meeting calling for "less emphasis on meeting qualifications and more emphasis on counselors being sensitive to. . .(Mexican American) problems."

Chambers later recalled that in general the task force was receiving a fairly sympathetic response from the board and the administration. He said they saw a legitimate concern, "they didn't say it's a bad idea. . .we just didn't get any action."[9]

Following this meeting, the Superintendent received two letters from Mexican Americans opposing the hiring of other than fully qualified counselors and expressing the view that all Mexican Americans were not represented by FLOC and the Brown Berets. A different view was expressed in an open letter to the board of education by the Assistant Director of the Guadalupe Center, who wrote of her anger at the board's questioning the lowering of standards. "It is impossible," she wrote, "to lower your educational standards as it applies to the Mexican-American students. This system has been hitting rock bottom for 50 years. The sad thing is that you smart people cannot see or feel it in your insensitivity."[10]

---

[9] Chambers to Larson.

The Superintendent also received a letter from the Board of Community Relations that strongly recommended serious consideration be given to dropping certain requisites demanded by state certification. He responded that he was "aware of the power struggle that is going on among the Mexican-Americans, particularly at Guadalupe Center. There was a strong delegation of Mexican-American parents in attendance at the board meeting who expressed that their presence was in support of the Toledo Public Schools and the steps to be taken."[11]

The tempo and spread of the confrontations were increasing. At this point, the school system began to search for federal funds to help in the solution of the problems. On May 4, 1970 the Director of Educational Innovation wrote to the USOE concerning application for a bi-lingual project; "we would like to begin a program soon, if possible by September, 1970."[12]

During the same period of time, the City-Wide Committee of the Study for the Seventies was in the process of organizing. In April, both FLOC and the Advisory Committee of the Guadalupe Center contacted the administration, pointing out the absence of any Mexican American representative on the committee. Both organizations named the same person as their choice.[13] She was a member of FLOC and the vice president of the Guadalupe Advisory Council. At this point in the Guadalupe dispute, the advisory council was controlled by FLOC. What appeared to be two organizations selecting one person was in reality a move by FLOC to be the representative of the Mexican American community on the City-Wide Committee of the Study for the Seventies.

---

[10] Lola Guzman to Board of Education, no date (May, 1970).

[11] Frank Dick to Burt Silverman, May 5, 1970.

[12] Dorothy F. Pasch to Albar Pena, May 4, 1970.

At the June 1, 1970, meeting of the committee, the issue of Mexican American representation was brought up. The chairman stated that it was his feeling that the Mexican American groups should elect their own representative. He stated that there was agreement that the group should be represented, but that a decision must be made as to how the groups would choose them. "Under all the circumstances, the Superintendent stated that the name of. . .(the Mexican American representative) would be eliminated creating an opening for nomination from the floor." He further ruled that being named by two organizations did not constitute nomination and made the decision that the representative present could not be put into nomination.[14]

In an almost anti-climatic move, the committee, on July 6, 1970, created two at-large seats designed for representatives of the Mexican American community. One was filled by the original FLOC representative, who attended but one meeting,[15] the other by a member of Los Latinos Unidos.

---

[13] Baldemar Velasquez to Frank Dick, April 15, 1970; Antonio Alonzo to Frank Dick, April 15, 1970.

[14] City-Wide Minutes, June 1, 1970.

[15] Roman to Larson.

Meanwhile, the Education Task Force continued to appear before the public Board of Education meetings. At the May meeting, the administration presented another progress report. The report reflected that the administration had been in touch with a number of agencies and organizations with reference to helping solve Mexican American educational problems. A number of programs were listed for implementation for summer school or the fall: Adult Basic Education for Mexican American people, English as a Second Language project, and plans for hiring more aides and a Spanish-speaking school psychologist. The Assistant Superintendent reiterated that all positions would be filled by only fully-certificated personnel.[16] The programs mentioned were to be funded by federal or state grants. The school system still had not been able to recruit and hire any Mexican American counselors and had no specific plans for the inclusion of Mexican American history as a specific course in the secondary curriculum.

The progress report at the June meeting did not contain very much that had not been reported earlier. If anything, it reemphasized the administration's position of hiring only certified counselors, by printing the state certification requirements in detail. The Task Force responded through the statement of a priest from a North Toledo parish: "Up to this time there has been no formal response specifically to these demands. . . (counselors and history) of our March 30th presentation. . . . It would seem that if verbal communications fail once again this evening, our next approach to the Toledo Public School System would demand more direct means." Alicia Pacheco also spoke to the board, "to reaffirm our deep concern over the school system's lack of sensitivity to our basic social and cultural needs, as is already manifested by your failure to respond to our requests."

---

[16] Board of Education Minutes, May 25, 1970, pp. 84-85.

At this point the board session disintegrated into a shouting match when Ysidro Duran, the new Director of the Guadalupe Center tried to get the floor without having requested time to speak prior to the meeting. He was later permitted to speak and urged that counselors with high school diplomas be hired. The Superintendent reaffirmed the administrations stand on the state law.[17]

A member of the Brown Berets assessed the situation thusly: the board "responds in kind of a negative way, 'so we hire this guy here and these three teacher aides and that will keep them quiet.' They always try to stay on top no matter what. A lot of times they make it seem as if they are compromising, but in the long run they stick you in the back."[18]

The administration's official response to the Education Task Force was to send their chairman a copy of the April, May, and June progress reports.[19]

The now monthly encounters at the Board of Education meetings continued in July. In a quite conciliatory statement, considering the implied threat made by the priest at the previous meeting, the Chairman of the Task Force spoke of the reports as encouraging. She did have a list of new questions for the administration, such as which schools were served by Mexican American teachers, progress of recruitment efforts, and with reference to the governmental proposals: "Do you support the idea that the participation of Mexican Americans in preparing these proposals would be helpful? How are you involving representatives of the Mexican American community in preparing these proposals?" This was the first time the Task Force had addressed itself to this aspect of the problems they had been presenting to the board.

---

[17] The Blade (Toledo), June 16, 1970.

[18] M. Pacheco to Bobowski.

[19] Emory Leverette to Chester Chambers, June 22, 1970.

In a personal letter to the chairman of the Task Force, the Assistant Superintendent wrote of the school system's intentions of creating a committee to work with multi-ethnic concerns. The group would not be restricted to Mexican Americans, but would include members of other ethnic groups.[20]

The July Board of Education meeting followed the established pattern, with a progress report by the administration and a set of presentations from the representatives of the Task Force. The discussion took a turn however, when two of the board members began to question the administration's view of progress and action. The following exchange took place.

> 1st Board member: Mr. Leverette, I noticed that most of this report is concerning the children and the educational opportunities for children but some people wrote in and asked. . .some points that I thought might make sense. They were talking more in terms of "what action are we taking to follow through on the things that we had talked about doing, particularly in hiring adults and counselors and teachers and people to actually carry through with this program, and as they point out particularly, Mexican-American descent." Do we have a specific program or system for searching and finding people who qualify for this, or are we just sitting back and hoping that they'll come in and apply for jobs.
>
> 2nd Board Member: Have we actually gone out and actively recruited? For instance, have we gone to centers where we have fairly large Mexican American populations?[21]

---

[20] Emory Leverette to Dolores Rodriquez, July 17, 1970.

[21] Exchange at Board of Education meeting, July 8, 1970.

The Assistant Superintendent replied that a number of people had applied for the specific positions. He spoke of contacting a few local universities, but in essence his remarks indicated that there was no specific program of recruitment presently in action. The same month, the Deputy Superintendent invited eight Mexican Americans to a meeting to discuss the existing and proposed programs that spoke to their concerns.

Those invited to the meeting were all involved in a direct or indirect way in the series of confrontations with the administration over the past five months.[22] Eight topics were discussed at the meeting:

1. Continuation of a bi-lingual program;
2. Continuation of a summer settled-out program with emphasis on oral language and bi-lingualism;
3. Expansion of adult basic education programs;
4. Interest in providing a Mexican American staff with language facility and cultural understanding;
5. A need for someone to play a role between the home and the school providing services such as identifying needs for clothing, food, improved shelter and counsel. This role in place of a professional counselor;
6. Efforts should be made to find scholarships for Mexican American high school graduates;
7. Homemaking centers should be provided for parents; and
8. Any bi-lingual program should give equal time to both languages.

---

[22] La Raza Unida, Guadalupe Center, Crossroads, Podres Unidas, Los Latinos Unidos, The Task Force, Brown Berets, and FLOC; (July 31, 1970).

It appears from this list of items that the role definition of what the community called counselors was more clearly expressed, while the study of Mexican American history was not broached.

The Task Force sought and gained the support of other Mexican American groups throughout the city. The perceptions held by members of the Task Force that the Board of Education was showing no progress or even answering their questions helped in unifying these usually disparate groups. A joint letter was forwarded to the Superintendent on August 17, 1970. The significance of this letter lay not in the continuing pressure it applied, nor in the specificity of its requests, but in that it represented one of the few times the Mexican American community had shown any semblance of unity. Ten Mexican American community organizations and agency representatives personally signed the letter. This group was later to serve as the source of the members for the administration-formed MACO Advisory Council.

A TMM organizer said that the Task Force's major strategy was "to just to continue surfacing the issue,"[23] and they did just that, with a presentation at the August Board of Education meeting.

A field representative for La Raza Unida--who was later elected Chairman of the MACO Advisory Council--represented the Task Force before the board. He repeated the Task Force's earlier requests and reviewed all the steps taken by the group thus far. "We feel," he said, "the Board of Education is taking our request too lightly and that the questions asked have not been properly answered." He then asked the Board of Education to respond to five questions:

---

[24] Chambers to Larson.

1. How many Mexican-American teachers are presently employed in the Toledo School System, their names and schools they serve, and the possibility of hiring them for counselors?

2. How many visiting teacher aides will be employed, their salary, names and duties and what schools they will serve?

3. With reference to the hiring of a specific Mexican American, we would like to know in what capacity, his duties and what school he will be serving?[24]

4. Reports indicate commitment to recruit Mexican-American teachers, counselors, aides and staff. How are these individuals being recruited? How many have been recruited to date and in what capacity?

5. Proposals are being prepared or have been prepared to respond to these concerns. Did Mexican-Americans participate in preparing these proposals?

Following the meeting, members of the Task Force talked with members of the Board of Education. Board members indicated that they would hire Mexican American counselors, if they could be found. They asked the Task Force representatives to assist in recruiting some candidates. Within ten days, the Chairman of the Task Force wrote to the Teacher Personnel Office with the name of a man they recommended. "We are not only recommending that . . .(he) be considered for the position but are strongly endorsing him. . .this recommendation. . .clearly shows that we are not going to stand idle and are willing to do our share in fulfilling this goal."[25]

---

[24] The man in question was appointed the same night as a Vocational Counselor at Libbey High School.

[25] Dolores Rodriquez to Alvin Bippus, September 4, 1970.

The man recommended, a native of Mexico, was hired as a community counselor at-large, stationed in a South end junior high school. The community might have acted in haste, for the man had the view that "Mexican Americans do not want to work, they do not make efforts, they want everything from the government."[26] An original member of the Task Force said the man "said he was going to do this and do that, after he gets the job he doesn't recognize us or relate to us."[27]

The Deputy Superintendent responded to the Task Force's questions late in September. He listed the schools with Mexican American teachers but did not furnish their names because of the policy of not releasing them on the basis of ethnic groups. He described the school system's efforts at recruitment and listed the Mexican Americans hired as a result. A high school level Mexican American history course would be offered if it had enough student interest, a well-developed course of study, and an interested teacher qualified to teach the subject.

It was at this point that the first public mention was made of what was eventually to become MACO.

> For the past five years, we have been working on developing an international studies center for secondary youth in Toledo. At the present time, we have two components to this overall goal. . . (Chinese-Russian Study Center and Afro-American Curriculum Office). Our third effort in this respect is to develop a center for the study of Americans of Spanish descent. A proposal will be developed during this school year and presented to the State Department of Education who provides funds under ESEA Title III.[28]

---

[26] Statement by Leonardo Flores in interview with Bobowski, August 4, 1971.

[27] Statement by Raymond Pacheco in interview with Bobowski, July 6, 1971.

[28] Lee R. McMurrin to Dolores Rodriquez, September 25, 1970.

The August Board of Education meeting was the last one before which the Task Force made a presentation. They wrote but one more letter to the administration. The administration began to invite members of the Mexican American community to preview some audio-visual materials, and had one Mexican American from the Task Force represent the school system in recruitment efforts at several Texas universities. From this point on, the attention of both sides was centered upon the preparation of a series of proposals which spoke to all of the community's expressed concerns.

SUMMARY

The Education Task Force of the North Toledo Corridor Area Corporation, over the period of one year, constantly confronted the Toledo Board of Education with concerns over the education of Mexican Americans. The intensity and persistence of their demands began to show results in two ways: (1) the school system slowly but surely began not only to respond, but to implement some programs to help; and, (2) the issues raised began to unify the elements of the Mexican American community to a degree not heretofore exhibited. Most every Mexican American leader, from throughout the city, gave credit to the North Toledo people for bringing about the negotiations that resulted in MACO.

As idealistic as the Taks Force members may have thought they had been, in the sense of attempting to solve some evident educational problems, the Superintendent of Schools held a different view of their motives.

"What I think," he said, "possibly motivated these individuals to come forward was that there were so many federal dollars in the black community, that people in the Mexican American community probably started thinking, 'well how can we get some of these funds.' Probably the base of it all was federal funds for job opportunities. . .to get jobs for Mexican Americans. The Afro-American Office was a true desire to get contributions of blacks into the social studies."[29]

A Mexican American teacher seemed to express the view of the more militant members of the Task Force when he said, "there is no sympathetic ear down at the board. I don't think the board gives a damn what happens. . .(to the Mexican American) as long as they can keep them off their backs."[30]

It was with these divergent views that elements of the Mexican American community and the school system began their negotiations concerning the establishment and control of MACO. These developments will be discussed in the following two chapters.

---

[29] Statement by Frank Dick, personal interview, August 29, 1972.

[30] Cervantes to Larson.

Chapter 6

JOINT PLANNING FOR A FEDERAL GRANT PROPOSAL

INTRODUCTION

Once the initial demands of certain elements of the Mexican American community had been impressed upon the school system, a joint effort at securing funds for a Mexican American Curriculum Office began. These efforts, their result, and the underlying, fundamental question of control of the project will be presented in this chapter.

THE SCHOOL SYSTEM SEEKS FEDERAL FUNDS

Two previous specialized curriculum offices in the school system, Chinese-Russian and Afro-American, had been funded under Title III, ESEA. The administration turned to this same source in an attempt to fund a third such office.

The Prospectus

On September 23, 1970, the school system submitted a prospectus to the Division of Research, Planning, and Development of the Ohio Department of Education. The prospectus called for Title III, ESEA, monies to be granted to the Toledo Public Schools for the creation of a Mexican American Curriculum Office. According to the prospectus, this specialized curriculum office would (1) provide curriculum materials in the history and culture of the Mexican American; (2) conduct staff development; and (3) evaluate and make available appropriate published materials. These proposed activities were identical to those of the Afro-American Curriculum Office, with the obvious difference of ethnic focus. No mention was made of any counseling services or personnel.

Within this brief prospectus, the applicant agency was asked to "list cooperating agencies, and the title and role of persons not representing an agency who assisted in the planning of this prospectus." The prospectus contained the names of eight Mexican Americans at this point. These eight people had met with the Deputy Superintendent late in July and had dealt with the general concerns their groups had been presenting to the board of education. They were not aware of the specifics of a specialized curriculum office nor of the fact that their names would be used as they were on the prospectus a number of weeks later.

The prospectus arrived at the state Title III office a few days past the submission deadline. The former Director of the state Division of Research, Planning, and Development recalled that it was his "unpleasant responsibility" to inform Toledo that they had missed the deadline for state submission. "It was at that time," he said, "that we did make a commitment to Toledo that we would recommend the project for direct federal funding." He said that his office had had some prior conversations with people in the USOE about the feasibility of the program and its implications to the Toledo area.[1]

It can only be viewed as conjecture that at this point the fate of late submission to the state resulted in there eventually occurring more community involvement in the program. The 306 program referred to above required a great deal of community involvement, whereas the state guidelines did not.

---

[1] Statements by Russell A. Working, personal interview, August 31, 1972.

Section 306, Title III, of ESEA 1965, as amended by Public Law 91-230, allowed the U.S. Commissioner of Education to "make grants directly to local education agencies for programs or projects that hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the solution of critical educational problems common to all or several States."[2]

Under Public Law 21-230, 85 percent of the Title III funds were allotted to the states while the remaining 15 percent remained for use by the Commissioner. The law also stipulated that 15 percent of both these accounts had to be expended on programs for handicapped children. Thus, for fiscal 1971, Section 306 contained $17,278,584 for the funding of new projects, with $975,845 allocated for Ohio.[3]

In fiscal 1971, 141 Section 306 projects were funded out of this Commissioner's Discretionary Fund. "He may spend these monies as he pleases," said the Project Officer, Special Projects Branch, Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers, USOE. "The states are unhappy with the by-passing type of arrangement. The idea of 306, however, was to lead the state guidelines in the area of accountability."[4]

In describing the characteristics that the Commissioner was looking for in proposals, the guidelines included those with "optimum participation of the community in program design, implementation, and evaluation."[5]

---

[2] U.S., Office of Education, A Manual for Project Applicants and Grantees; Special Programs and Projects, Title III, Section 306, ESEA 1965, Draft (Washington: Office of Education, December, 1971), p. iv. (Mimeographed.) Hereafter cited as Project Manual.

[3] Project Manual, pp. v, vii.

[4] Statements by Gene Engle, personal interview, November 23, 1971.

[5] Project Manual, p. xi.

The Preliminary Proposal

Formal notification of the availability of the Section 306 funds was received in the Superintendent's office on January 4, 1972. It was not until ten days later that the word reached the administrators who were assigned to write the preliminary propoasl, which was due in Washington by February 4, fifteen working days later. This aspect of close deadlines, and always seeming to be behind, was a constant in the entire development process. As a member of the advisory council later pointed out, "if the committee had really started from scratch, it would have taken them a year to write the proposal. . .that was frustrating to the committee."[6]

The first question asked in the directions for writing the narrative section was "What groups and individuals helped plan this preliminary proposal? What did they contribute?" One of the final questions, dealing with development of a strategy for the preparation of the formal proposal, asked "What students, parents and community representatives from the target schools, nonprofit private school representatives, public school personnel, and other persons broadly representative of the cultural and educational resources of the area will help to develop the formal proposal?" In addition, the applicant agency had to sign a list of assurances which included one that community people had been involved in the "establishment and carrying out" of the project.[7] It was obvious that the school system had to form an advisory council if there was going to be any hope the preliminary proposal would be considered for further development and eventual funding.

---

[6] Chambers to Larson.

[7] Project Manual, pp. 137, 138-39.

With these requirements in mind, the administration began to form an advisory council for the purpose of needs assessment input for the preliminary proposal. All the representatives of the community groups and agencies that had signed the unity letter to the Board of Education the previous summer were invited, as well as representatives of the Toledo Catholic Diocese. The group totaled seventeen. It met with representatives of the administration at the school system's central office on January 25, 1971.

At this meeting, the segments of the Mexican American community present ranged over a wide variety of education orientated problems. Bi-lingual instruction, college scholarships, better communication among all concerned, textbook selection procedures, absenteeism, drop-outs, need for traveling Mexican American teachers, cultural understanding, day care centers, teacher training, and other such problems were presented for inclusion in the preliminary proposal. It was a genuine outpouring of years of accumulated concern and frustration. The group became so deeply involved in voicing these concerns that the issue of who would control the project was never brought up.

That community input spoke to much wider concerns than the prospectus had contained. The administration broadened their original concept of a specialized curriculum office and included in the preliminary proposal as many of the community's concerns as possible. Although the name of the proposed project was never changed, from that point on it was to be much more than a curriculum office. A more appropriate name might have been, the Mexican American Educational Affairs Office.

PLANNING FOR SUBMISSION OF THE FORMAL PROPOSAL

The preliminary proposal was submitted on time. All anyone could do now was to wait for further word from Washington. During this period, there were no requests, confrontations, presentations, or meetings held.

Section 306 Community Involvement Guidelines

"The Office of Education recommends that representatives of all segments of the community be involved in the development and operation of projects and requires that a formal community council be established for each project."[8] The project manual was quite clear on that point, however, it was much less precise when it began to define the role such a community council should play in the development and operation of the project.

After warning that the early establishment of precise guidelines concerning the relationship of the council to those with legal responsibilities for the schools, and open discussion of these relationships, "will help to avoid the misunderstandings and conflicts which common result from a lack of clear definition of roles and responsibilities" the guidelines presented only general suggestions. Community councils might provide:

1. Assistance in program planning, including the assessment of needs and the selection of project activities and priorities;

2. Participation in the establishment of criteria for the selection of project personnel, and the interviewing and screening of prospective staff members;

3. Recruitment of volunteers and assistance in the mobilization of community resources;

4. Assistance in staff development programs for project staff, school personnel, and community representatives;

5. Assistance in program evaluation activities;

---

[8] Project Manual, p. 21.

6. Service as a channel for complaints and suggestions for program improvements;

7. Assistance in the dissemination of information about the project throughout the community; and

8. Coordination of the project with the entire local educational agency, with professional organizations, and with public and private agencies.[9]

The project manual said that "no single model is appropriate for all districts, and the guidelines do not propose a specific model" for community involvement.

The former Director of Ohio's Division of Research, Planning, and Development had attended a number of meetings in Washington concerning Section 306 Guidelines. The state educational agency people were troubled by the section on community involvement. Although they were very much in favor of such involvement, they did not feel that a formalized kind of involvement was appropriate for every project. "The nature of the project," said the former director, "ought to determine whether there would be a formalized community involvement. Local school people ought to be responsive to these pressures if the climate were appropriate and conducive to involvement." He pointed out that the federal government took a real stand however, in response to pressure groups involved in Title I, ESEA. These groups were saying that what was appropriate for involvement in Title I should be appropriate for involvement in all other kinds of programs. The USOE looked upon Section 306 as "providing for controlled change of education throughout the United States. . .it hasn't come to fruition."[10]

---

[9] Project Manual, pp. 26-7.

[10] Working to Larson.

An individual representing a private consulting firm that conducted independent, educational accomplishment audits of numerous Section 306 projects throughout the country, remarked that "they don't know at USOE what role advisory councils should play. . .they are edgy over community participation."[11]

With the clear mandate that the community would be involved as never before, the administration received word on April 1, 1971 that the preliminary proposal had been approved for development into a formal proposal. At the same time, informal word was received that the major screening by USOE had taken place on the preliminary proposals, and that unless something drastic were to occur, MACO would be funded for the first year for approximately $200,000.

Forming the Community Advisory Council

The first step in further development was to be a conference in Chicago from April 12-14, 1971 on the format, content, and general requirements of the formal proposal. In addition to the administrators charged with developing the proposal and an evaluator, the USOE required a community representative to be present at the sessions. The administration was in a dilemma: of all the Mexican Americans that had been confronting the Board of Education for over a year, which one person could represent the community at the conference?

Details of submission and deadlines were unknown to the administration at that time, thus they were hesitant to call an Advisory Council meeting. The decision was made to ask the Chairman of the Advisory Council of the Guadalupe Center to attend as the community representative.

---

[11] Statement by King Davis, personal interview, November 19, 1971.

This particular chairman of the seemingly perpetually controversial Guadalupe Advisory Council, held the view that the name Chicano meant "tricky, liar, and a cheater." He felt that people without even "a high school degree should not advise administrators with degrees. . . it's sad. . .how much authority do these people want?"[12] The Director of EOPA commented on the man, "he's just rediscovered he is a Mexican."[13] Thus, by sending this man to Chicago to represent the Mexican American community, the administration appeared to be saying, "this is our kind of Mexican American." The other elements represented on the MACO Advisory Council never forgot, nor forgave, the administration for this choice.

At the conference, it was learned that the school system was eligible for a $10,000 planning grant and that the deadline for submission of the formal proposal was May 21, 1971. A few days following the conference, the administration filed for the $10,000 planning grant and began to lay plans for an advisory council.

On April 21, 1971 the Director of Social Studies wrote to twenty-five people -- Mexican Americans, as well as community agency and diocesan representatives. They were asked to serve on a Community Advisory Council for the development of the formal proposal. Calling for the continuing participation of the community, the administration said that it was attempting to broaden the base of the committee that had met to help plan the preliminary proposal. The base was broadened to include representatives from the Model Neighborhood Residents Association of Model Cities, a local cultural and service center--the International Institute--and high school students.

---

[12] Garcia to Larson.

[13] Palmer to Bobowski.

The MNRA was given a seat on the council because of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's requirement for a Model Cities sign-off, that is, that they participated in the planning for the project. The MNRA never responded to communications concerning the project, nor attended any of the Advisory Council meetings. The International Institute representative was on the Advisory Council in order to provide a broader perspective of intercultural relations. She attended one meeting, was accused of racial prejudice in float assignments in an international day parade, and never attended another meeting.

The administration also decided not to invite two people to serve who had been on the previous one-day council. One was the TMM staff member responsible for the formation of the North Toledo Corridor Area Corporation, Chester Chambers; the other, Raymond Pacheco, father of Moises and Alicia, of the Brown Berets.

Chambers recalled: "I wasn't invited to be a member. I got invited to the meeting by Ray Pacheco, who also wasn't invited. I really didn't know what it was when I went. I showed up at the first meeting and got added."[14] Pacheco said: "they didn't put me on. . .they don't want any troublemakers."[15] Both men were added to the council at the first meeting by other members of the Advisory Council.

---

[14] Chambers to Larson.

[15] R. Pacheco to Bobowski.

Was the council as finally constituted a representative one? The answers to a question such as this were as varied as were the members of the council. The President of FLOC said the administration packed the council with people "who were going to be with the school board. . . people of a very conservative mentality in terms of basic attitude toward the movement."[16] The Deputy Superintendent felt that "a majority of the committee represented more vocal and special interest groups."[17] The conservative Chairman of the Guadalupe Advisory Council said that the council was not representative, "there are three and four people of the same family. . .it is organized of Chicanos and militant youth of the community."[18] The eventual chairman of the council said that,

> in the history of Toledo there has not ever been one particular project that has brought so many people together from so many factions in the Toledo area. Even though there are problems, nevertheless people can talk to each other at this point. It's in a way amazing, because this has never happened before.[19]

The council that was formed contained all of the segments of the Mexican American community that had been confronting the Board of Education. Because of the federal guidelines calling for non-public school involvement, representatives of the Toledo Catholic Diocese were on the council. That contributed to the political intricacies of the council, based upon the Church's prior and continuing involvement with the Mexican American community. What the school system faced, was not a united front of community activists, but a disjointed conglomerate, rife with formal, informal, and familial relationships.

---

[16] Velasquez to Larson.

[17] Statement by Lee R. McMurrin, personal interview, August 18, 1972.

[18] Garcia to Larson.

[19] Rodriquez to Larson.

Joint Planning Efforts

At the first meeting, on May 4, 1971, the administration described the timeline involved in the preparation of the proposal, pointing out that it consisted of just thirteen working days. During these thirteen days, the council and the school system met for more than eighteen hours of negotiations.

One of the first orders of business was the election of a temporary chairman. The council had already agreed that it would include in its membership those people who had appeared at the meeting. Thereupon, Raymond Pacheco nominated Chester Chambers for the position of temporary chairman. Thus, an Anglo was elected the first Chairman of the MACO Community Advisory Council. "I thought it was inappropriate," Chambers said later, "however, I did it to prevent John Garcia from getting it, and to make sure in the long run that we had people in there who "were sympathetic to our goals." "There wasn't anything worked out ahead of time. . .I saw it as a temporary move."[20]

The administration was concerned, for it was presently going through the difficult process of trying to close off the Study for the Seventies, also chaired by a pastor from the Toledo Metropolitan Mission. Their anxiety heightened as the council began to speak to its concerns over control and power of the council.

---

[20] Chambers to Larson.

The day following that first meeting, the Deputy Superintendent met with the two administrators charged with developing the project, the Director of Evaluation and the Director of Social Studies. They went over a list of possible areas of conflict of interpretation over control of MACO by the Community Advisory Council. It was at this point that the school system began to refer to the council as the Community Advisory Council rather than as the Community Council as it was referred to in the project manual.

The administrators addressed themselves to a series of issues which they felt could lead to community control of the project. The Deputy Superintendent decided that the council could assist in determining the number of qualifications of the staff. The council, however, would have no part in such things as hiring, deciding salary level, staff evaluation, budget control, location, and any direct relationship with the staffs of the target schools. With these understandings, the two administrators met with the council the following day.

Present at the May 6, 1971, meeting,[21] the second one of the series leading to the formal proposal, was the USOE Program Officer assigned to monitor and review the MACO formal proposal, Gene Engle.

The nominating committee reported to the council that their only recommendations were that the permanent chairman be a Mexican American, that three officers be nominated and elected from the floor--a Chairman,

---

[21] All of the Advisory Council and Executive Committee meetings were recorded on audio-tape. All of the information concerning these meetings came from these tapes, augmented by the presence of this writer at all such meetings.

Vice Chairman, and a Secretary--and that the chairman then appoint five additional people to make an executive committee of eight.

Following nominations, statements from the four people nominated for chairman, and a series of votes, the officers were elected. The Chairman was Celso Rodriquez, the young field representative from La Raza Unida. He won over Moises Pacheco, of the Brown Berets, who became Vice Chairman; Ricardo Cervantes, a high school teacher, who became Secretary; John Garcia of the Guadalupe Center, and Leonardo Flores, a school-community coordinator. The Chairman appointed Ysidro Duran, Director of the Guadalupe Center, John Garcia, Rudy Lira of the EOPA Migrant Division, Raymond Pacheco, and Melinda Sanchez, a high school student and Secretary of La Raza Unida, to the Executive Committee.

The Chairman then called for a discussion of the authority of the council, and asked the administration what the council's power was to be. The administrators deferred to the USOE Program Officer. Engle said that there was

> no authority to go outside the rules and regulations of the State Department of Education or of the local educational agency (LEA). The ultimate authority rests with the LEA. The advisory council is as the name implies--advisory. It can become involved in establishing certain criteria, input in program, you know what certain needs you have. This actually should be a cooperative effort. We can't go way outside the system--we still have to work within the system. The input should be taken under consideration. Now to me it would seem illogical if a particular need existed for a LEA to ignore that. That is one of the purposes and functions of the advisory council. . .to advise the school system of the needs and what they would like to see within the framework of the eligibility. Now if it is something that is impossible to perform because it is illegal I think it would be irresponsible of an advisory board to advise something which is illegal
>
> The hiring is the ultimate authority. The hiring rests with the board. Now you can help establish in the planning, certain criteria for the employment of individuals. So you can assist in that. . . It seems to me that it would be illogical as an advisory council to, let's say, hire someone who doesn't have the minimum requirements as established by the state and the LEA.

Raymond Pacheco said "what we want is the authority to say what goes in the program. . .we want to get jobs in the Board of Education, you don't have enough people (Mexican Americans). They give us the worst jobs, other people will get the high jobs, they lie to us."

The Chairman asked Engle what would happen if some advice were given by the council that was not accepted, or ignored, by the board. He replied that maybe not everything was going to be implemented. The minutes should reflect that the idea was presented, he said. The council laughed at that; Engle was not saying what they wanted to hear, or even directly answering their questions. It was apparently a difficult position for him, for as a representative of USOE he wanted to remain as neutral as possible, interpreting the guidelines, not going beyond them, and making policy.

The Deputy Superintendent entered the discussion. He told the committee that they were getting in on the ground floor of a new program and to not let some dissatisfactions with the past interfere. He felt that it was important not to work under any illusions so that no one would be dissapointed at some later date. "To say that this group has that power. . .(of hiring) is telling you something that isn't true. To say that you will be the screening and the recommending group would again be in error. The greatest duty of this committee is to assist in the development of that proposal. This is not a project in community control."

He answered a question about the proposal needing community approval by stating that the school system could send it in without the full approval of the council. However, "it would be foolish for us to send one in knowing you are not going to work with us."

The FLOC representative responded "you are insulting us very much, you are saying you are our father and we have to go to you. . . we're up to here with that paternalistic role." "That's rhetoric mister" said the Deputy Superintendent heatedly.

At that point, Rudy Lira interrupted and attempted to ease the tension by reminding everyone that the channels of communication must stay open, "we must work hand in hand as equals--we need each other." The USOE Program Officer observed that what had been occurring was what they would like to see happen. "We have had some open discussion, you are agents for change, this is a good demonstration right here," he said.

Members of the group began to speak in Spanish, and then asked all of the administrators to leave the room. Protesting that speaking in Spanish was as good as leaving the room, the staff people left for a short while. This issue of the community's effectively shutting out the administrators by breaking into Spanish was a recurring one. The administrators were suspicious of many of the representative's motives in the first place, and highly resented the use of this exclusion device. Their opposition to the speaking of Spanish was not based on any desire to deny any of the group's cultural background. The council members seemed to find enjoyment in the use of their native tongue as a method of confounding and agitating the staff members. The staff had portions of the audio-tape translated at one point, but found it to be time consuming and generally unproductive. Before long, everyone began to know everyone's position on the issues anyway, and to know what they were saying, in English or Spanish.

The discussion that ensued after the staff had left the room revolved around the issue of Anglos always running things and getting the money. A few people seemed to feel that the proposal had already been written, and had not provided for their input. The Chairman suggested that the Board of Education not be allowed to send the proposal in until the council approved it, and that the approval should be written in the council's presence.

After everyone had reassembled, the Chairman's suggestion was moved, seconded and passed. Engle supported the idea, saying that "I am not going to approve a proposal that is doomed to failure." The two and one-half hour meeting was adjourned at that point.

The next meeting, on May 10, 1971, lacked a quorum, however, that was not a problem. Although there was some discussion from the FLOC representative about the need for an impasse panel in case of a deadlock, the majority of the meeting was devoted to needs assessment.

The following day another session took place. The President of FLOC, Baldemar Velasquez, attended the meeting in place of the regular representative. The entire meeting revolved around the issue of binding arbitration, as introduced by the FLOC representative. The administration had prepared a document entitled "The Role and Function of the Community Council for the Mexican-American Curriculum Office, Title III, Section 306."[22] This paper contained the statements on community involvement from the project manual, the comments made by the USOE Program Officer at the May 6, 1971, meeting, and a statement on the powers of the chairman and the Executive Committee. It also summarized the administration's position on community control:

---

[22] See Appendix B.

> Nowhere in the above remarks or in the Manual does the concept of community control or ultimate authority appear, either implicitly or explicitly. Accordingly, the Toledo Public Schools views the role and function of the Community Council to be as stated in the eight points listed above from the Manual.

Velasquez responded to the position paper: "I don't consider what the Board of Education has to say very relevant to us here. . .this is their opinion. I don't mind being an advisory board if there is somehow we can arbitrate. . .this could turn into a Mexican standoff." From this point on, the discussion was between the President of FLOC and the Deputy Superintendent. The other members of the council were noticeably quiet.

The administration's position was that there would be no such thing as a process of binding arbitration on programatic matters. If there were to be problems, the council could take them up the school system's chain of command. Velasquez said that was no precedent in the community to trust anybody, much less the school system. "All I am suggesting," he said, "is that in case we do have a difference we have a way of dealing with it now. . .if we don't, our chances of dealing with it later are poor." FLOC continued to push the issue, arguing that because the Board of Education needed the council to get funding, "right now that is the only bargaining power that we have." The Deputy Superintendent said "the answer to binding arbitration is absolutely no."

FLOC persisted. "I think we've uncovered a big rat here," said Velasquez. The Chairman turned to Velasquez in an attempt to shut off the now pointless talk, saying to him, "they are not going to do it, there is no way in hell they are going to." Once again the administrators were asked to leave the room, the tape recorder was turned off, and the Chairman attempted to restore some unity within the council. Back together again, the council demanded the Superintendent appear to answer the question of binding arbitration "once and for all." The meeting was quickly adjourned until the next afternoon.

The Chairman felt that the project was "being used as a staging ground for a power play. . .I am trying to keep it neutral."[23] Referring to Velasquez, he said "being on the ego trip that he is, I wouldn't put it past him to scuttle the project if he doesn't get his way."[24] Velasquez said, "I can't deny that we used the board to gain power. If a person wants to fulfill a certain idea there has to be a vehicle in order to do it. If there is a board that you can use as a forum for those ideas, then that's the best place to do it." He added that the council was rather dead when it first started, "but when we started to raise hell people really started to get involved in it. . . mostly out of fear of the new ideas we were proposing in our own community."[25]

It appeared as if a showdown on the issue of community control was imminent. The Superintendent recalled, "we were close to dropping the project. I don't think there would have been any dire consequences if it had been dropped. They wanted a project, and they could have been held responsible for losing it.") He felt that the council would not go that far; "we were dealing in brinksmanship."[26]

---

[23] Rodriquez to Bobowski.

[24] Rodriquez to Larson.

[25] Valesquez to Larson.

The showdown did not occur. Apparently FLOC felt they did not yet control the council, and no FLOC representatives showed up at the meeting on May 12, 1971. Many other people did however. Some extra Brown Berets, a local parish priest, students who had yet to appear at a meeting, and two university observers helped pack the tense meeting room, already filled with the administrative staff and the council. The Superintendent made his only appearance before the Advisory Council.

"Frankly," he said, "I am a little surprised that you have spent so much time and energy in here on the matter of power. Power, what is power anyway. Power is when you get something done." He warned the council that if they wrestled about power for five weeks, they would be losing $600,000 over three years. "Because you are on a committee it doesn't mean you have the ultimate authority." He pointed out the great amount of input they had had, and emphasized that they were to develop a curriculum project. "Not," he added, "a project where we establish a lot of jobs." He reinforced the Deputy Superintendent's position on there being no binding arbitration, and then excused himself to attend another meeting.

The Chairman: "Well you heard what the man said. I don't know what else to say to you." A brief discussion ensued which pointed out the choices the council faced: do the best with what they had or walk out on the project. With FLOC absent, the sentiment was strongly for staying with the project. Lira summed up their feelings:

---

[26] Dick to Larson.

> There are two kinds of power: political power and money power. I think we should work as much as we can into developing the proposal. After it has been developed and we go to sign it, we can approve or disapprove it. I don't think we should call it a defeat right now, we can veto it later.

The Advisory Council quickly approved the position paper presented by the administration at the previous meeting, twenty to zero. The Brown Berets and the Pacheco family abstained from voting.

The question of control did not arise at the next meeting, on May 17, 1971. The administrative staff presented their suggestions as to the schools to receive first priority in services. The council agreed on this list of target schools. The budget was also presented in detail. There was a difference over the amount of salary for the non-certified guidance workers. The staff felt the salaries had to remain in line with existing non-certified pay scales; the council argued for $1100 more per worker. The council wanted the Deputy Superintendent to come to the next meeting and resolve this dispute. It was he, in rejecting binding arbitration, who had called for disputes to go up the school system's chain of command.

The meeting held the following day was the last prior to the submission on May 21, 1971. The staff came back with the salary figure the council had asked for at the previous meeting. There was some discussion among the council members concerning how Garcia had been chosen to go to the Chicago conference in April, and that the project had really started in the North End, not on the East Side where Garcia lived. After prolonged discussion, Lira once again acted as peacemaker: "We know the North Toledo people started this, the credit is given. Now more people have come together; now we are working for the same object."

The budget was approved after some additional discussion over the quality of the desks being purchased versus money for educational supplies. A list of first year objectives was presented, warmly received, and approved.

On May 27, 1971, the deadline for the formal proposal to be in Washington, a staff member handcarried the 115 page document via an airline flight. Seventeen days had elapsed since the first Community Advisory Council meeting.

SUMMARY

The months of confrontations with certain specific segments of the Mexican American community increased the school system's desire to obtain federal funds to help attack some of the problems. These same funds came with the strings of community involvement attached. Thus the school system, if it wanted to both ease the pressure as well as provide the necessary programs, was forced into a deeper relationship with the very elements that had been pressuring it.

The pressure did not let up, for instead of facing one or two elements of the Mexican American community, the administration was facing eight or nine. These segments were not all together however, and power maneuverings within the council added to the complexity of writing the formal proposal.

Community control questions came up in the meetings much more often than educational need concerns. When pressed, the school system fell back upon the Section 306, Title III, guidelines, as vague as they were. With the additional support of state law to back them, the school system staved off the issue of binding arbitration and community control.

The Community Advisory Council did not walk out on the project, but rather, took the approach of working to get the funding, and then coming back to the issue of control. The issue of hiring power will occupy the following chapter, which ends with the hiring of the Project Director, as does the development process described in this dissertation.

Chapter 7

JOINT PLANNING FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF MACO

INTRODUCTION

The deadline for submission of the formal proposal had been met. Under the pressure of time, the Community Advisory Council had reluctantly agreed to the school system's definitions of community involvement. Now the funding was almost assured, and the council had more time to regain some of the desired power, especially in the important area of staffing. The negotiations for the role the council would play in the hiring procedure will be described in this chapter. Also described will be the discussions over the school system's hiring freeze and the continuing maneuvering for power within the Community Advisory Council. The examination of the development process leading to the Mexican-American Curriculum Office will conclude with this chapter.

THE HIRING FREEZE

At the May, 1971, Board of Education meeting, a resolution was passed to freeze the hiring of all personnel, purchase of educational supplies, and letting of contracts for building maintenance. The purpose of the freeze was to insure a larger carry-over of funds from 1971 to 1972. Anticipated income for 1972 was thought to be much less than in the past, and the inflationary spiral was affecting the school system. No additional personnel were to be hired for the school year 1971-72 and vacated spots were not be refilled.

When the freeze was first explained to the staff members of the school system, there was an assumption made that programs funded entirely with federal or state monies would be exempt from the resolution. The administrators working directly with the MACO Community Advisory Council expressed that view to some members of the council.

An informal council meeting was planned for the late afternoon of Friday, June 4, 1971. Advisory Council members were invited to pick up their copies of the formal proposal and discuss what the next steps would be. Staff members planned to announce that the position of project supervisor had been formally posted and advertised that same day. In attempting to obtain copies of the announcement they had written, these administrators were informed that the position was not to be advertised and that copies of the announcement would not be sent out. The Superintendent had interpreted the hiring freeze as extending to all state and federal programs, wh ich included MACO.

Throughout the day, formal and informal conferences were held within the administration. At these conferences the two administrators working with the council attempted to persuade higher level administrators to exempt MACO from the freeze extension. There were to be no exceptions. A newly hired administrator, the Executive Director of State and Federal Programs, remarked that "I don't know that I have ever seen a group of people so washed out and depressed. After months of working, and knowing full well that the community would take this as a very real challenge."[1] The Deputy Superintendent felt he should be the one to inform the council of the freeze extension.

---

[1] Working to Larson.

At the meeting, the Deputy Superintendent slowly explained that personnel from outside the school system would not be hired for the MACO project. Lira reacted quickly. "Are you saying," he asked, "that the people we hire for this project are not going to be hired because of the freeze? Are you saying that you are using that $200,000 that is coming here for the Board of Education?" The chairman pointed out that all of the positions called for in the proposal totaled more than the number of Mexican Americans presently in the school system. Thus the council saw the freeze extension as the administration's way of grabbing the MACO funding for their own use, as well as filling a large number of the job positions in the project with Anglos.

Lira continued, "You worked like hell to get this thing together, and look at the frustration on those two men." (This referring to the other two administrators present.) "We are going to have to send for somebody from the Mexican American legal department," he shouted. "This was not our understanding with the proposal. . .if we can't get together, nothing comes about." The Deputy Superintendent responded that "it is very painful to have a project so beautifully developed and then to come into a sort of party for celebrating and you asking me hard questions and my giving you hard answers." The meeting was adjourned in confusion. That evening the Blade reported an announcement from Washington that the MACO project had received full funding.[2]

The Community Advisory Council sought legal support from the Advocates for Basic Legal Equality (ABLE). "Three members of the committee came to us," recalled an ABLE lawyer. "Celso Rodriquez had been authorized to write a letter and they wanted some help with the letter."[3] With the help of ABLE, a letter was written to the Superintendent and presented at a council meeting on June 7, 1971.[4]

---

[2] The Blade (Toledo), June 4, 1971.

The Community Advisory Council addressed itself to three concerns, (1) the role the council would play in staff hiring; (2) the role of the freeze on the project; and (3) the issue of transferring people already employed to the new project. The letter stated in part:

> 1. At page seven of the formal proposal it is clearly stated that the Community Council will participate in the "interviewing and screening of prospective staff members" thus, the issue is not whether or not we will participate, but rather in what manner we will participate.
>
> 2. We wish to receive your assurance that since the individuals to be hired under this program will not be paid out of the general funds. . .but rather out of a Federal grant, the freeze will in no way effect the hiring procedure.
>
> 3. It is not enough to transfer people within the system to the special office and thus fail to increase the ratio of Mexican-American citizens employed by the Toledo Public Schools. . .this program must be staffed with new blood.

The Deputy Superintendent presented a proposal to hire project staff from outside the system for the remainder of the summer. It was his hope that the freeze would be lifted in the fall and that those people could then be hired for the full term of the project. He did not want to hire someone for 1971-72 during the freeze, for this would encumber money for 1972, the year the Board of Education anticipated a deficit. The council rejected the proposal on this basis that the employment was temporary, with only verbal commitment for fall employment.

---

[3] Harris to Larson.

[4] Celso Rodriquez to Frank Dick, June 7, 1971.

The Deputy Superintendent stated that the Board of Education's position on the freeze would change if a different interpretation was obtained from the elected Board members who passed the resolution. He also agreed to consider the formation of a Personnel Committee made up of persons from the administration and the council. The meeting was adjourned with no resolution achieved on the concerns presented in the council's letter.

Meanwhile, the USOE required a negotiations conference on program and budget. The conference, to be held in Chicago on June 9, 1971, was attended by the Chairman of the Community Advisory Council and members of the school system's administrative staff. Even though the USOE Program Officer had told the administrators earlier that it was not necessary for a community representative to be present at the negotiations, the administration felt someone from the council should be at the meeting. The staff was not faced with their earlier dilemma of who should represent the community, the Chairman appeared to be a safe choice.

At least one member of the Community Advisory Council did not agree, for Raymond Pacheco drove to Chicago to attend the negotiation conference. He also arranged for a Mexican American representative of the Human Relations Division of the Department of Justice to meet him at the conference.

Despite the apparent makings of another showdown, not much came of the meeting other than a discussion of routine matters concerning the implementation of the project. The USOE Program Officer expressed concern over the problems between the school system and the council but stated that they should be solved locally. He added that he should be contacted if the problems were not resolved.

FORMING A PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

The day following the Chicago negotiations conference, the Executive Committee of the Community Advisory Council met at a North Toledo parochial school to hear the chairman's report on the conference. The administration was unaware the meeting was being held.

The Executive Committee passed a motion to establish a personnel committee made up of three members each from the council and the school system. The "committee will screen, interview, and select candidates for. . .(the staff). They will use the criteria outlined in the formal proposal in the selection of these persons. No candidate may be considered for this program by the Board of Education unless he has been appointed by this personnel committee."[5] On June 14, 1971, the full Community Advisory Council approved the Executive Committee's recommendation.

These two meetings signified a watershed in the negotiations between the council and the administration. From that point on, great use was made of the Executive Committee in direct negotiations with the administration, with representatives from ABLE present at all such meetings. Also, it was apparent that the council's way of combating the effects of the freeze was to attempt to become a full partner in the selection of project personnel.

Negotiations for Community Involvement in Personnel Selection

The Executive Committee met with the administration on June 15, 1971. Present at that meeting for the first time was the newly hired

---

[5] Minutes, MACO Community Advisory Council Executive Committee, June 10, 1971.

Executive Director of State and Federal programs, a new position in the school system. His appointment had been made prior to the freeze resolution. Formerly, he had been the Director of the Division of Research, Planning, and Development, of the Ohio Department of Education. As related in Chapter 6 above, he had prior knowledge of the MACO proposal.

The basic purpose of the meeting was for the presentation of the administration's answer to the Community Advisory Council's letter of nine days earlier. The administration's letter[6] presented the school system's position on community involvement versus community control. The administration reaffirmed that the council "will assist the school staff in developing the criteria for interviewing and screening prospective staff members."

In the draft of the letter, as written by the staff working directly with the council, the above phrase had read "we want you to participate in the screening of prospective staff members. This is a step beyond the agreement in the formal proposal." This phrase was removed by the Deputy Superintendent in the actual letter.

With reference to the freeze, the administration repeated that it still applied to MACO. "I am confident," wrote the Deputy Superintendent, "that fulltime staff can be secured for the school year 1971-72 to comply with the time schedule as outlined in the proposal."

The ABLE lawyer present at the meeting later voiced the opinion that "the letter was a slap in the face. . .calculated to arouse, with no grounds for compromise and a few platitudes."[7]

---

[6] Lee R. McMurrin to Celso Rodriquez, June 15, 1971.

[7] Harris to Larson.

The issue of community control came up once more at the meeting. The Deputy Superintendent charged that there were advisers who were keeping the issue of community control alive. The Chairman responded that it seemed appropriate "that at this point we should deal with this problem that you call community control and we call community participation." The lawyer from ABLE interjected that he did not think "the people ever had in mind control of this program." The Deputy Superintendent said, "I think some of the advisers have, Mr. Chester Chambers has." That was the first time the issue of advisers pushing for control had been brought out in the open; it had, however, been a frequent topic for discussion with the administration. However, nothing further came of this short, but heated, exchange. Shortly before adjournment there was some more discussion concerning the freeze, however, neither side really said anything that had not been said before.

The same group, with the exception of the Deputy Superintendent, who was replaced on the committee by the Executive Director of State and Federal Programs, met again on June 17, 1971. The administration presented a method of screening candidates that prohibited the community from meeting the candidates face-to-face. The Executive Committee members talked to one another in Spanish. When asked to speak in English so everyone could participate, one member replied, "no, that's the problem you've got. . .it's on tape, you get it translated anyway."

The Chairman asked why the administration was trying to complicate things. "You say we have to play the game your way or we don't play the game at all." he said. Once more the group broke into their native tongue, telling the administrators "get your Spanish book or stay out--those are the only two choices you got." In general, the administrators were having a difficult time explaining why the community could not meet the candidates face-to-face. Finally one of them said, "to be perfectly candid with you, the boss said no." The Chairman replied, "Please go back and ask him again."

An administrator left the meeting and went to do as the committee requested. After explaining the stalemate to the Superintendent, and stating that he saw no danger in such interviewing, the administrator received the Superintendent's permission to have the committee personally screen candidates.

Back with the group, the new position was presented: three members from each side on the personnel committee, face-to-face interviewing, and, still smarting from the earlier rebuffs from the group about speaking Spanish, the administrator impulsively added, "all conversations and interviews will be in English so that we can understand what is going on."

Rudy Lira exploded, "in the Constitution of the United States you prove to me that English is the official language of the United States. Are you telling me that my language is no good--I will never give up my Spanish language, never!" Lira recalled later that

> When I was in school I was forbidden to speak Spanish. I was put in the third row for Mexican Americans there. I got slapped by teachers. I got punished by my parents. Damit, I didn't have anything to do with being born Mexican Amerocan. . .and here, after thirty five years of age telling me, forbidding me to speak my native tongue, so the same rotten things go on. I was deeply hurt.

The demand for English only was very quickly withdrawn, but the damage had already been done. In the heat of the exchange, both sides almost lost sight of the Superintendent's concession. Shortly thereafter the meeting was adjourned.

Within a week, three more meetings of the Executive Committee with the administration were held. Once the log jam of face-to-face interviewing had been broken, the details of the procedure came quickly, and by previous standards, almost effortlessly. The agreement was that the chairman would appoint three members of the Community Advisory Council to serve on a personnel committee, along with three staff members chosen by the administration. Candidates would meet with these six people, with a majority vote necessary to place an applicant among the final three. The names of the final three candidates were to be presented to the Superintendent with no preferences indicated. It was understood that the Superintendent did not have to limit himself to recommending one of the three to the Board of Education. On this last point, the ABLE lawyer warned that "if that happens, I and this committee will be picketing and putting out press releases."

These meetings were relaxed and full of good natured bantering between the two sides. As one administrator assessed the situation,

> When there was agreement about the personnel selection committee it was a real high point for the administrators. We have support from the top and agreement with the community. It had been a grinding kind of negotiation that left the school administrators feeling pretty good about it, for we saw no mechanism for a long time.[8]

The Chairman of the council stated that the administration made a number of concessions, but only after hours and hours of meetings. "When we were just about ready to give up," he said, "they said 'okay we will give it to you. . .remember we didn't have to give it to you." He also felt that there were some points the council would never get, "the ultimate authority really rests with the Board of Education, that is something we never will be able to change--at least presently."[9]

---

[8] Working to Larson.

On the role of ABLE in the personnel selection negotiations, Lira felt the lawyers were a definite help because "the board gave in."[10] An administrator involved in the negotiations disagreed. "I don't believe ABLE made the board come around," he said. It did make the negotiating team for the board more sensitive to its own actions. It never altered the basic relationships." He also felt that the ABLE representative never really served the council's purposes during the meetings. "The community members," he said, "tended to ignore much of his initial output. The board never provided a basis for legal action."[11]

"The threat of a lawsuit is always more superior to an actual lawsuit," said the ABLE lawyer. "We felt we did have some basis, first, a moral basis which was perhaps stronger than a legal base." This, he explained, was the board promising things and then not really letting the people have some input. The legal basis "was merely the freeze."[12]

On July 1, 1971, the Community Advisory Council was to meet to hear the Chairman's report on the personnel selection negotiations. At the Executive Committee the afternoon before, the Chairman expressed concern about recommending too much to the council. The Vice Chairman echoed his thoughts, saying "these cats are going to have some doubts about us. . .I just don't want the hassle that might come out of it." The Chairman, apparently convinced now that the Executive Committee "had done its homework," said "what do you want to do, open it up for everyone to get his mouth into?"

---

[9] Rodriquez to Bobowski.

[10] Lira to Larson.

[11] Working to Larson.

[12] Harris to Larson.

The Community Advisory Council passed the Executive Committee's recommendations on personnel selection. There was no apparent problem concerning the power of the Executive Committee. In other business, the council decided that those members missing three consecutive meetings be eliminated from the council. This did not mean the group would no longer be represented, just the individual representing the group. At the end of the meeting, the Chairman appointed Rudy Lira, Sylvester Duran, and David Alvarado as the Personnel Committee. The Council concurred with his selection.

If, in fact, the creation of a Personnel Committee was a significant breakthrough for increased community involvement with the project, those community members selected should be viewed as those the council felt were most representative of the community. Lira, the Director of the Migrant Division of EOPA, and one-time member of FLOC, was highly respected by a large segment of the community, with the obvious exception of FLOC. Sylvester Duran, the Director of the Department for the Spanish Speaking of the Diocese, was also respected, and considered to be a conservative. Alvarado, a sixth grade teacher in the school system, must also be considered as a conservative. The more radical elements were not represented, nor were any of the North Toledo Task Force people.

The President of FLOC said that his group was consciously excluded from the personnel committee. "We say we can pull at least 50 percent of that council now." He added that FLOC had been doing "a lot of leg work, a lot of convincing out on the side." He stated that their next move was to "get influence in that personnel committee. We have accomplished things like that in the past--we took over a whole OEO (Office of Economic Opportunity) agency in Celina (Ohio)."[13]

Personnel Committee Actions

The six members of the Personnel Committee met for the first time on July 26, 1971. No interviews were held at the meeting, as one of the members, David Alvarado, resigned because he wished to apply for the position of Project Supervisor. With the Community Advisory Council's approval, the Chairman appointed himself to the Personnel Committee. The only dissenting votes were cast by the two FLOC representatives.

Six people applied for the position of project supervisor, four of them Mexican American: two from Toledo; and one each from Bowling Green, Ohio; Dubuque, Iowa; West Espanola, New Mexico; and, Canton, Ohio.[14] Following interviews during the middle of August, the Personnel Committee's unanimous recommendation to the Superintendent was David Alvarado, a Toledo teacher. The Superintendent, in turn, recommended Alvarado to the Board of Education. He became the Project Supervisor of MACO in September, 1971. The other staff positions were all to be filled by October 22, 1971.

---

[13] Velasquez to Bobowski.

[14] Minutes, MACO Community Advisory Council, July 28, 1971, p. 2.

An administrator on the Personnel Committee remarked that there had been a close relationship among the members of the committee "based upon common agreement."[15] A community member said, "it wasn't that hard. I think to me it was pleasant--it was very pleasant to be there."[16]

CONTINUING CONCERNS OF THE COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

While the negotiations within the personnel committee were going smoothly, other activities by individuals and groups within the Community Advisory Council, when taken together, presented a picture of continuing controversy.

During the first week of July, 1971, representatives of the school system, evaluators, and the council's Vice-Chairman attended a USOE conference in Atlanta, Georgia. Here the community representative had opportunities to talk with other such representatives from 306 projects and Title VII Bi-lingual projects. He reported back to the council that some Title VII projects had more community involvement than MACO. "Other regions of the country" he reported, "regardless of source of funding have involvement similar to ours." He suggested that a special USOE conference be held for Community Advisory Groups "in which emphasis would be placed on the meaning of community involvement and the functions of an advisory group."[17]

When asked to compare the community involvement of the MACO council to his other thirty-seven 306 projects, the USOE Program Officer reported that none of the project's councils had control, but that "no other has as much vocal interest or involvement" as MACO.[18] The educational auditor hired to audit the MACO project said that of the fourteen 306 projects his firm was auditing, only one--a drop-out prevention program in Detroit--had more "control" than the MACO council.[19]

---

[15] Working to Larson.

[16] Lira to Larson.

[17] Moises Pacheco, "Report on the Educational Program Auditing Institute, Dinkler Plaza Hotel, Atlanta, Georgia," July 12-16, 1971.

At the July 28, 1971 council meeting, the administration reported that the initial audit of the formal proposal stated that the project's goals were too general and difficult to evaluate. The council formed a sub-committee on goals to help the administration recast the objectives. As opposed to the Personnel Committee, FLOC and Task Force people dominated the Goals Committee.

The President of FLOC, in reflecting on various goals his organization perceived as necessary, said "some say get the people together first. What the hell are you going to have when you get the people together? A conglomerate of nothing, of people who don't really understand what they are fighting." He said he intended to use the Goals Committee to bring out FLOC's goals for the community.[20]

During the later part of the summer, apparently dissatisfied with the form of the MACO formal proposal, Raymond Pacheco was circulating a proposal for another grant. Authored by a committee called "The Spanish-Speaking Information Center Committee," the proposal called for, among other things, cultural appreciation programs, adult basic education classes, and a bi-lingual program for the Spanish-speaking students in the public and parochial school systems. It sought $233,298 in first year operating funds. The proposal was addressed to Toledo's Model Cities program.[21]

---

[18] Engle to Larson.

[19] Davis to Larson.

[20] Velasquez to Bobowski.

In September, 1971, an exchange between the Superintendent and the Community Advisory Council erupted over another application of the freeze to MACO. The only person hired by that time had been the project supervisor, and he was transferred from within the school system. The council sent a letter to the Superintendent threatening legal action if the freeze were, in fact, applied to MACO.[22]

The Superintendent, responding that the original commitment to MACO was unchanged, reassured the council that "since the staffing needs of this project are unqiue, the hiring freeze would result in an unreasonable constraint against the project." The Superintendent promised to abide by all previous commitments negotiated with the council.[23]

Thus as the Project Supervisor began to implrment the Mexican-American Curriculum Office, many of the "same old" problems were flowing through the Mexican American Community.

SUMMARY

Following submission of the formal proposal in May, 1971, the Community Advisory Council and the school system continued their negotiations, principally over selection of staff. The council members reacted with anger to the extension of the financial freeze to include all state and federal programs. Their worst fears appeared to have happened--the Anglos using them as tokens in order to obtain federal money.

---

[21] In 1972, Model Cities gave $20,000 of "underrun" or left over money to the proposed center, but left it out of the proposed 1973 Model Cities budget when only five families of Mexican Descent were found to live in the Model Cities area. (The Blade (Toledo), September 14, 1972.)

[22] Celso Rodriquez to Frank Dick, September 27, 1971.

[23] Frank Dick to Celso Rodriquez, September 29, 1971.

The application of the freeze to the MACO project was an unfortunate action on the part of the administration. It may be considered as the low point in the entire negotiations for the project, from the administrators' point of view. The action had an opposite effect upon the council, for it served to unify the various factions within the group. Thus, what was the high point for one side was the low point for the other.

Armed with new resolve, and less pressure of time, the council successfully negotiated to become a full partner in the personnel selection process. Their gains in this important area of involvement had never been achieved by any other community group.

A number of constants continued to operate within the group, such as the power maneuvers, and the dissatisfaction of some council elements with both the approach MACO was going to take and the power of the council. Twenty months after the North Toledo Corridor Area Corporation had been organized, the newly hired Project Supervisor began to implement MACO. Old questions still lingered, and as Rudy Lira stated at one time during the confrontations, "There is an old saying, 'Never be afraid to destroy with your right hand that you have built with your left if you find it to be wrong."

Chapter 8

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

QUESTIONS OF THE STUDY

The object of this study was to examine the dynamics of one specific series of community confrontations with public school decision-makers. Such a study appears to be one step toward improved communications, processes, and programs among all concerned with education. Specific questions which directed the investigation were:

1. What were the organizing forces that created the pressure which resulted in the forming of the Community Advisory Council?

2. What did the Mexican American community, as represented by the Community Advisory Council, perceive as deficient in the educational programs offered their children?

3. What role did the Community Advisory Council feel the Mexican American community should play in the change process?

4. Who did the members of the Community Advisory Council and the educational decision makers perceive as leaders of the Mexican American community and how did these leaders' perceptions of the need for community control differ from interest group to interest group within the Mexican American community?

5. How did the Community Advisory Council and the educational decision makers negotiate their differences?

6. Can suggested guidelines for successful community involvement in educational decision-making be formulated as a result of this study?

SUMMARY

Although the Mexican American population of Toledo, Ohio had organized a number of community based organizations, none of them had ever confronted the public school system over their children's educational status. The organizations which did exist were primarily social in nature and only infrequently touched upon problems of the Mexican American community, such as housing, unemployment, and education. There were two organizations, the Farm Labor Organizing Committee (FLOC), and the Brown Berets of Northwest Ohio, which were somewhat different in their orientation. Both were considered by the Mexican American community, as well as the community at large, as militant elements. FLOC, especially, gained this reputation by confronting the Mexican American community with charges of racism against blacks, criticism of the authoritarianism of parents, and attacks against the community's attachment to the Roman Catholic Church. The last point was especially evident in FLOC's dispute with the Toledo Diocese over obtaining a former diocesian summer camp as a permanent home for settled-out migrants. Thus, prior to the formation of an advisory council for the Mexican-American Curriculum Office (MACO), the various elements that together comprised Toledo's Mexican American community had shown no tendencies towards unity of purpose in any endeavor.

It took the organizing efforts of an agency known as the Toledo Metropolitan Mission (TMM), a department of the Toledo Area Council of

Churches, to form an effective pressure group. Staffed by five ministers, the TMM was a social action agency which helped create the North Toledo Corridor Area Corporation. Out of this corporation grew its Education Task Force. The TMM put this primarily Mexican American group through an action training program during the early months of 1970. In the spring of the same year, the Education Task Force began to confront the Board of Education of the Toledo Public Schools with demands for a series of curricular and administrative reforms.

The school system had been involved with a few previous incidences of desire by community groups for a say in educational decision-making, primarily under the regulations of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). It had been successful in both meeting, and in some cases exceeding, the federal regulations, as well as controlling the decision making powers of the advisory groups they organized. The school system was also going through a labored attempt at grass-roots, city-wide community participation known as the Study for the Seventies.

The school system's initial responses to the Task Force's demands for Mexican American counselors and recognition of Mexican American contributions in the curriculum, were to claim that efforts were being made in both areas. The issue of a definite lack of availability of certified counselors of Mexican American descent became central in the dispute. The administration's position was that they would hire only certificated personnel, while the Task Force saw such a requirement as an impossible hurdle, and thus called for a lowering of the requirement.

Over the period of one year, the intensity and persistence of the Task Force's demands began to show results in two ways: (1) the school system began to slowly respond by implementing some programs that would aid Mexican Americans; and (2) the issues raised began to unify the elements of the Mexican American community to a degree not heretofore exhibited. The administration made application for federal monies available under Title III, Section 306, ESEA. The guidelines for application required the formation of a community council during preparation and implementation stages of any funded project.

Accordingly, the school system invited representatives of all of the elements of the Mexican American community that had been pressuring them, to serve on a community council. The joint planning efforts of these community representatives and board administrators were filled with constant confrontations over the council's power, as well as maneuverings among the groups themselves for community power. The constraint of time appeared to be the major factor that forced the council to help the administration come up with a project proposal that, while it spoke to their educational needs, did not contain the elements of community control many of the council members wanted. Thus, when the formal proposal for MACO was submitted in May, 1971, certain specific elements of the council continued their fight for greater community involvement with the project, particularly in the selection and hiring of personnel.

Negotiations for the establishment of a personnel committee, with the power of recommendation for hiring, took place between the council's Executive Committee and the school system. A new element was the presence of legal advisers for the community representatives, in the form of the Advocates for Basic Legal Equality (ABLE). ABLE had been called in by members of the council in response to the administration's application of a general austerity move to include all state and federal programs. This hiring freeze had been thought to apply to only general fund departments of the school system, not fully-funded federal projects such as MACO.

After many hours of heated negotiation, it was agreed that a personnel committee composed of council members and administrators would interview candidates for the MACO staff, and recommend appointment to the Superintendent. It was in this manner that a member of the Community Advisory Council, a teacher of Mexican American descent, was hired as Project Supervisor in September, 1971.

CONCLUSIONS

Based upon the research reported above, and with specific reference to the guiding questions of this study, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. The organizing force that created the pressure which resulted in the forming of the Community Advisory Council was the staff of the Toledo Metropolitan Mission. The TMM, through a participating protestant denomination, obtained a grant which eventually financed the action training necessary to create the pressure group, the Education Task Force of the North Toledo Corridor Area Corporation. In addition, another non-Mexican American agency, the Advocates for Basic Legal Equality furnished minor support to elements of the MACO council during personnel procedure negotiations.

An important factor in the forming of the Community Advisory Council was the requirement of the federal government that such a council be formed. Without this requirement, the administration would have probably formed a one-time only, merely token, council.

2. The Mexican American community, as represented by the Community Advisory Council, identified the following needs as the most pressing ones for their children:

a. Bi-lingual and bi-cultural teachers were needed throughout the elementary school grades.

b. The curriculum had to more fairly present the contributions, culture, and heritage of the Mexican American, with a special Mexican American history course needed in high school.

c. Mexican American students needed to be counseled by personnel who were sensitive to their needs.

d. Teachers and principals who had responsibility for educating Mexican Americans, should have become more aware of and dealt more effectively with bi-lingual and bi-cultural children.

e. Better understandings had to be developed between the school system and the Mexican American community.

f. Instruction in the Spanish language was needed at all levels for Mexican American children.

In addition to the above, FLOC introduced a questioning of the viability of the public schools as they were presently constituted. They gained no support from any other element with regard to that questioning.

3. The Community Advisory Council felt it should be a full partner with the school system in assessing needs, developing programs addressed to these needs, setting budget allocations, determining criteria for staff, screening and hiring staff, and general participation in the operation of MACO once it was implemented. Certain elements on the council desired the additional security of a binding arbitration agreement with the school system.

4. The school system tended to work most cooperatively with the more conservative elements on the council, those representatives that viewed their role as one of participation and involvement, not control. The administration actively resisted the majority of the input from the more militant groups, including that of the two agencies they considered as agitators, the TMM and ABLE. There was no strong power base within the council, and the school system faced not a unified pressure group, but a collection of small pressure groups gathered together for common good. The administrators working directly with the council did not recognize this until after at least the first three meetings of the council.

With the exception of FLOC, who at the most demanded an impasse panel, the Community Advisory Council did not demand control of the program to the equivalent of other community control situations, such as Ocean Hill-Brownsville in New York. The council always backed down at the point of law, which the administration found to be their most potent weapon in negotiations. The council's position may be best understood if one were to replace the term "control" with "security." Security that the Mexican American was not going to be tricked and used by the Anglo.

5. The Community Advisory Council and the educational decision makers negotiated their differences in a series of face-to-face sessions that were painful to each side. The negotiations were painful to the council because they were dealing on one level, that of personal experience, while the administrators were task-oriented and operating on the level of program development. The council members also saw themselves as having seemingly endless arguments with the administration over matters the council saw as their right in the first place.

The administrators found the negotiations painful because they were constantly on the defensive, with no prior relationships, no patterns, upon which they could fall back. They were constantly being pressured for answers to situations for which there were no precedents. In addition, they were forced to second-guess how far they would be permitted to go with the council and still be supported by higher administration.

The negotiations were further complicated by the constant maneuverings for power occurring within the council. Conflicts between groups that had nothing to do with the school system, or education in general, were a part of the everyday MACO negotiating sessions. Racism against blacks surfaced during the sessions, and the presence of FLOC and the diocese on the same council placed additional stress on an already complex situation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The nature of the sample interviewed and of the study itself will not allow for generalizing to other populations. However, based upon the conclusions drawn as a result of the study, the following suggestions for improved negotiations and cooperative educational development seem justified.

1. A concerted effort should be made by school systems to dispell any attitude of paternalism on their part. The concept of parity, full partnership in all aspects of the process that are permissible under law, must underlie all negotiations with community groups.

2. Advisory councils should include all segments of the community to be served by the results of any negotiations. While it is recognized that it will be difficult to include what might be termed the silent majority, advisory councils should not be limited to only the activist groups representing either extreme on a local political continuum.

3. School systems should not present a plan, however appropriate it might appear, to be reacted to by an advisory council. Such plans should be built together, no matter how time consuming, or the concept of parity is violated.

4. Although program deadlines may sometimes make it difficult, negotiations should not be constrained by the pressure of time.

5. A school system should learn as much as possible, as objectively as possible, about the community with which it is negotiating. Such knowledge will help sort out the conflicting pressures and counter pressures present in negotiations, aiding in their isolation. Such

isolation will help the council proceed with the educational purpose of the negotiations. This surfacing and isolating of hidden agendas will prove beneficial to both sides.

6. Boards of Education should conceive policies on community advisory councils to present to such groups at their inception. Such guidelines should not be formed during the pressure of heated negotiations, and should act as support for those negotiating with the community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Altshuler, Alan. *Community Control: The Black Demand for Participation in Large American Cities*. New York: Pegasus, 1970.

Bailey, Stephen K., and Edith K. Mosher. *ESEA: The Office of Education Administers a Law*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1968.

Barrios, Ernie. (ed.). *Bibliografia De Aztlan: An Annotated Chicano Bibliography*. San Diego: Centro De Estudios Chicanos Publications, San Diego State College, 1971.

Bauer, Raymond A., and Kenneth J. Gargen (eds.). *The Study of Policy Formation*. New York: The Free Press, 1968.

Bendiner, Robert. *The Politics of Schools: A Crisis in Self-Government*. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Berube, Maurice R., and Marilyn Gittell (eds.). *Confrontation at Ocean Hill-Brownsville: The New York School Strikes of 1968*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1960.

Browder, Lesley H., Jr. (ed.). *Emerging Patterns of Administrative Accountability*. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1971.

Brussel, Charles B. *Disadvantaged Mexican American Children and Early Educational Experience*. Austin: Southwest Educational Development Corp., 1968.

Bundy, McGeorge, and others. *Reconnection for Learning: A Community School System for New York City*. New York: Mayor's Advisory Panel on Decentralization of the New York City Schools, 1967.

Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish Speaking People. *The Spanish Speaking in the United States: A Guide to Materials*. Washington: The Committee, 1971.

Cabrera, Y. Arturo. *Emerging Faces: The Mexican-Americans*. Dubuque: William C. Brown, 1971.

Cahill, Robert S., and Stephen P. Hencley (eds.). *The Politics of Education in the Local Community*. Danville: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1964.

Camejo, Antonio. (ed.). *Documents of the Chicano Struggle*. New York: Pathfinder Press, 1971.

Campbell, Roald F., Luvern L. Cunningham, and Roderick F. McPhee. *The Organization and Control of American Schools*. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1965.

Carranza, Elihu, Feliciano Rivera, and H. L. Cordova. Perspectives in Mexican-American Studies. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1971.

Carter, Richard F., and others. The Structure and Process of School-Community Relations. 5 vols. Stanford: Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University, 1966.

Carter, Thomas P. Mexican-Americans in School: A History of Educational Neglect. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

Colorado University. Institute of Behavioral Sciences. Urbanization of the Migrant. Boulder: University of Colorado Institute of Behavioral Sciences, 1968.

Cunningham, Luvern L., and Raphael O. Nystrand. Citizen Participation in School Affairs: A Report to the Urban Coalition. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Coalition, 1969.

Dahl, Robert A. Who Governs? New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Educational Research Service. Decentralization and Community Control: A Status Report. Circular No. 7. Washington: Educational Research Service, 1969.

Eidenberg, Eugene, and Roy D. Morey. An Act of Congress: The Legislative Process and the Making of Education Policy. New York: Norton, 1969.

Fantini, Mario D. The Reform of Urban Schools. Washington: National Education Association, 1970.

________, Marilyn Gittell, and Richard Magat. Community Control and the Urban School. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

Fein, Leonard J. Community Control of the Schools. New York: Pegasus Press, 1970.

Galarza, Ernesto, Herman Gallegos, and Julian Samora. Mexican-Americans in the Southwest. Santa Barbara, California: McNally and Loftin, Publishers, 1969, 1970.

Gittell, Marilyn. Participants and Participation: A Study of School Policy in New York City. New York: Frederick A. Prager, Publishers, 1966.

________, and Alan G. Hevesi (eds.). The Politics of Urban Education. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969.

Goldhammer, Keigh. Factors Related to Citizen, Administrator, and Teacher Participation in Educational Decision-Making. Eugene: University of Oregon, 1965.

Grebler, Leo, Joan W. Moore, and Ralph C. Guzman. The Mexican-American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority. New York: The Free Press, 1970.

Green, Robert L. (ed.). Racial Crisis in American Education. Chicago: Follett Educational Corporation, 1969.

Hagood, Henry B. Community Control of the Schools: A New Alternative. Detroit: Michigan-Ohio Regional Educational Laboratory, Inc., 1969.

Haubrich, Vernon F. (ed.). Freedom, Bureaucracy, and Schooling. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1971.

Heller, Celia S. New Converts to the American Dream? Mobility Aspirations of Young Mexican Americans. New Haven: College and University Press, 1971.

Hobson, Julias W. The Damned Children. A Laymen's Guide to Forcing Change in Public Education. Washington: Washington Institute for Quality Education, 1970.

Hollingshead, August B. Elmtown's Youth. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1949.

Hunter, Floyd. Community Power Structure. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953.

Johnson, Henry Sioux, and William J. Hernandez-M (eds.). Educating the Mexican American. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1970.

Kimbrough, Ralph B. Political Power and Educational Decision-Making. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1964.

Leeper, Robert R. (ed.). What are the Sources of the Curriculum? A Symposium. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1962.

Levin, Henry M. (ed.). Community Control of Schools. Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1970.

Lurie, Ellen. How to Change the Schools: A Parent's Handbook on How to Fight the System. New York: Random House Vintage, 1970.

Lynd, Robert S., and Helen M. Lynd. Middletown. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1929.

Manuel, Hershel T. Spanish-Speaking Children of the Southwest. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1965.

McWilliams, Carey. Ill Fares the Land. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1942.

________. North From Mexico: The Spanish-Speaking People of the United States. New York: Greenwood Press, 1949, 1968.

Meranto, Philip J. The Politics of Federal Aid to Education in 1965. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1967.

Mills, C. Wright. The Power Elite. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.

Minar, David W. Educational Decision-Making in Suburban Communities. U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project 2440. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University, 1966.

Moore, Joan W., and Alfredo Cuellar. Mexican Americans. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Morphet, Edgar, and Charles O. Ryan (eds.). Designing Education for the Future No. 2: Implications for Education of Prospective Changes in Society. New York: Citation Press, 1967.

National Education Association. The Spanish-Speaking Child in the Schools of the Southwest. Washington: NEA, 1966.

Polsby, Nelson W. Community Power and Political Theory. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Riles, Wilson C. The Urban Education Task Force Report. Final Report of the Task Force on Urban Education to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

Rogers, David. 110 Livingston Street: Politics and Bureaucracy in the New York City Schools. New York: Random House, 1968.

Romano-V, Octavio I. Voices: Readings from El Grito. Berkeley: Quinto Sol Publications, 1971.

Rosenthal, Alan. Governing Education: A Reader on Politics, Power, and Public School Policy. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1969.

Samora, Julian. (ed.). La Raza: Forgotten Americans. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966.

________, and Richard A. Lamanna. Mexican Americans in a Midwest Metropolis: A Study of East Chicago. Mexican American Study Project Advance Report 8. Los Angeles: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business, University of California, 1967.

Sanchez, George I. Concerning Segregation of Spanish Speaking Children in the Public Schools. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1951.

Schattschneider, E. E. The Semisovereign People. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.

Schram, Barbara A. Some Basic Guidelines for Building Parent Participation Groups to Effect Changes in the Public School System. New York: Two Bridges Parent Development Program, 1968.

Servin, Manuel P. The Mexican-Americans: An Awakening Minority. Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1970.

Smith, Mortimer. A Citizen's Manual for Public Schools. Boston: Atlantic, Little-Brown, 1959, 1965.

Soukup, James R. Party and Factional Divisions in Texas. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1964.

Squire, James R. (ed.). A New Look at Progressive Education. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1972.

Steiner, Stan. La Raza: The Mexican-Americans. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Taylor, Marie E. Educational and Cultural Values of Mexican-American Parents: How They Influence the School Achievement of Their Children. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1970. (Mimeographed.)

Urofsky, Melvin. Why Teachers Strike: Teacher's Rights and Community Control. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1970.

Vidal, Mirta. Chicano Liberation and Revolutionary Youth. New York: Pathfinder Press, 1971.

Vidich, Arthur J., and Joseph Bensman. Small Town in Mass Society. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1960.

Warner, W. Lloyd. Social Class in America. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1960.

Wasserman, Miriam. The School Fix, NYC, USA. New York: Outerbridge and Dienstfrey, 1970.

Webster, Staten. (ed.). The Disadvantaged Learner: Knowing, Understanding, Educating. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1966.

Weinberg, Meyer. (ed.). Integrated Education: A Reader. Beverly Hills: The Glencoe Press, 1968.

Wilson, L. Craig. The Open Access Curriculum. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Articles and Periodicals

Bachrach, Peter, and Morton S. Baratz. "Decisions and Non-Decisions: An Analytical Framework," American Political Science Review, LVII (September, 1963), 632-642.

Billings, Charles E. "Community Control of the School and the Quest for Power," Phi Delta Kappan, LIII (January, 1972), 277-278.

The Blade (Toledo), April 23, 1969 through September 14, 1972.

Campbell, Roald F. "Federal Impact on Board's Decisions," American School Board Journal, CLIV (March, 1967), 38-42.

The Catholic Chronicle (Toledo), May 8, 1970.

Cunningham, Luvern I. "Decentralization: A Forward Step? Community Control Clouds the Issue," Nation's Schools, (May, 1969)

Farias, Hector, Jr. "Mexican-American Values and Attitudes Toward Education," Phi Delta Kappan, LII (June, 1971), 602-604.

Fein, Leonard J. "The Limits of Liberalism," Saturday Review, LII (June 20, 1970), 83-85; 95-96.

Gittell, Marilyn. "The Potential for Change: Community Roles," The Journal of Negro Education, XL (Summer, 1971), 216-224.

Gottesfeld, Harry. "Educational Issues in a Low-Income Area as Seen by Community People and Educators," Phi Delta Kappan, LII (February, 1971), 366-388.

Hamilton, Charles V. "Race and Education: A Search for Legitimacy," Harvard Educational Review, XXXVIII (Fall, 1969), 669-684.

Harrison, William A. "The Public and the Public Schools: The Need to Build a New Sense of Community," Special Report. Washington, D.C.: National Committee for Support of the Public Schools, March, 1968.

James, H. Thomas. "Politics and Community Decision-Making in Education," Review of Educational Research, XXXVII (October, 1967), 377-386.

Jensen, Theodore J., and W. Frederick Staub. "School and Community Relations," Review of Educational Research, XXXI (October, 1961), 406-416.

Kirst, Michael W., and Edith K. Mosher. "Politics of Education," Review of Educational Research, XXXIX (December, 1969), 623-640.

Klapp, Orrin E., and Vincent L. Padgett. "Power Structure and Decision-Making in a Mexican Border City," American Journal of Sociology, LXV (January, 1960), 400-406.

Levine, Daniel U. "Concepts of Bureaucracy in Urban School Reform," Phi Delta Kappan, LII (February, 1971), 329-333

Lopate, Carol, and others. "Decentralization and Community Participation in Public Education," Review of Educational Research, XL (February, 1970), 135-150.

McNeil, John D. "Forces Influencing Curriculum," Review of Educational Research XXXIX (June, 1969), 293-318.

Merelman, Richard M. "On the Neo-Elitist Critique of Community Power," American Political Science Review, LXII (June, 1968), 451-460.

Minar, David W. "Community Politics and School Boards," American School Board Journal, CLIV (March, 1967), 33-38.

National School Public Relations Association. Washington Monitor.

Ortego, Philip D. "Schools for Mexican-Americans: Between Two Cultures," *Saturday Review*, LIV (April 17, 1971), 62-84; 80-81.

Salz, Arthur E. "Local Control vs. Professionalism," *Phi Delta Kappan*, L (February, 1969), 332-334

Samora, Julian, and Richard F. Larson. "Rural Families in an Urban Setting: A Study in Persistence and Change," *Journal of Human Relations*, IX (1961), 494-503.

Schulze, Robert O., and Leonard U. Blumberg. "The Determination of Local Power Elites," *American Journal of Sociology*, LXII (November, 1957), 290-296.

Strandt, Patricia, "Decentralization, Community Control--Where Do We Go From Here?" *American Teacher*, (May, 1969).

The Times (Toledo), September 1 and 9, 1945.

Valdez, R. F. "The Fallacy of the Spanish Surname Survey," *Journal of the California Teachers Association*, LXV (May, 1969), 29-32.

Watson, James B., and Julian Samora. "Subordinate Leadership in a Bi-cultural Community: An Analysis," *American Sociological Review*, XIX (August, 1954), 413-421.

Whittier, C. Taylor. "A Look at Decentralization and Community Control," *School Administrator* (January, 1969), 15-16.

Wilder, Amos. "Client Criticism of Urban Schools: How Valid?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, LI (November, 1969), 129-130.

Wolfinger, Raymond E. "Reputation and Reality in the Study of Community Power," *American Sociological Review*, XXV (October, 1960), 636-644.

Worthen, Blaine R. (ed.). "Title III," *Theory Into Practice*, VI (June, 1967), 101-164.

Public Documents

Governor's Committee on Migrant Labor. *Migratory Labor in Ohio*. Columbus: Ohio Department of Industrial Relations, 1966.

National Advisory Committee on Mexican American Education. *The Mexican-American: Quest for Equality*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968.

Ohio. Department of Education. *Ohio Conference on Migrant Education*. Columbus: The Department, 1968.

Ohio. Department of Education. *Title I, ESEA, Handbook on Parent Councils*. (Draft.) Columbus: The Department, n.d. (Mimeographed.)

Ohio. Department of Education. Toward a New Horizon: Migrant Education Programs in the State of Ohio. Columbus: The Department, 1970.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Stranger In One's Land. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Children at the Crossroads. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1970.

U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, Mexican American Affairs Unit. Mexican-American Education: A Special Report. Washington, D.C.: USOE, March, 1968.

U.S. Office of Education. Federal Programs to Improve Mexican-American Education. (by Clayton Bruce and others) Washington: USOE, 1967.

U.S. Office of Education. A Manual for Project Applicants and Grantees: Special Programs and Projects, Title III, Section 306, ESEA, 1965. (Draft.) Washington: Office of Education, December, 1970. (Mimeographed.)

Unpublished Materials

Apling, Daniel L. "An Analysis of a Large-City Mayor's Influence with Regard to Educational Decision-Making." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Toledo, 1970.

Belasco, James A., and others. "School Community Relations." Paper read at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March, 1970, Minneapolis.

Blome, Alvin C. "A Study in the Identification of Community Power Structure and Influence on Public School Issues." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, The University of Iowa, 1963.

Bobowski, Edward. "An Examination of Educational Attitudes of Selected Mexican Leaders in Toledo." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Toledo, 1972.

Church, Virginia. "A Comparative Study of the Attitudes and Aspirations of Bilingual Mexican American Students with Monolingual Mexican American Students." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Toledo, 1971.

Dumond, Jack W. "An Analysis of School Board Policy Decisions in Selected Arizona Public School Districts as They Relate to Community Pressure," Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Arizona, 1964.

Jenson, J. Byron. Spanish Surname Families in the City of Toledo. Toledo: Economic Opportunity Planning Association, 1971. (Mimeographed.)

Macklin, Barbara June. "Preliminary Report, Toledo Study, Americans of Mexican Descent." Toledo, Ohio: Board of Community Relations, 1958. (Mimeographed.)

Matthiasson, Carolyn W. "Acculturation of Mexican-Americans in a Midwestern City." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Cornell University, 1968.

Otis, John Albert. "The Relationship Between Citizen Interest in Schools and Social Rank and Urbanization," Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1966.

Smoley, Eugene R. "Community Participation in Urban School Government." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1965.

Soto, John. "Northwestern Ohio Chicano Power Movement." Unpublished paper, University of Toledo, August, 1971.

Spiess, John A. "Community Power Structure and Influence: Relationships to Educational Administration." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, The University of Iowa, 1967.

________. *Community Power Study Applications to Educational Administration.* Toledo, Ohio: Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, College of Education, The University of Toledo, 1971. (Mimeographed.)

Toledo Public Schools. *Formal Proposal: Mexican-American Curriculum Office*. Submitted for funding under ESEA Title III, Section 306. Toledo: Toledo Public Schools, May 20, 1971. (Mimeographed.)

Toledo Public Schools. *Initial Proposal: Afro-American Curriculum Office*. Submitted for funding under ESEA Title III. Toledo: Toledo Public Schools, February 25, 1970. (Mimeographed.)

Turner, Benton. "Utilization of Large Rural and Suburban Secondary School Sites by School and Community Groups in North Carolina," Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Duke University, 1965.

Werle, Henry D. "Lay Participation in Curriculum Improvement Programs," Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Columbia University, 1964.

Wilson, L. Craig. "Community Power Pressure and Control in Relation to Education in a Selected County." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1952.

Other Sources

Cervantes, Ricardo. Personal interview, February 24, 1972.

Chambers, Chester. Personal interview, August 29, 1972.

Davis, King. Personal interview, November 19, 1971.

Dick, Frank. Personal interview, August 29, 1972.

Duran, Sylvester. Interview with Edward Bobowski, July 7, 1971.

Duran, Ysidro. Interview with Edward Bobowski, July 6, 1971.

Engle, Gene. Personal interview, November 23, 1971.

Flores, Leonardo. Interview with Edward Bobowski, August 4, 1971.

Garcia, John. Personal interview, March 17, 1972.

Guzman, Lola. Interview with Edward Bobowski, July 31, 1971.

Haas, Robert. Interview with Edward Bobowski, July 6, 1971.

Haas, Robert. Personal interview February 28, 1972.

Harris, John. Personal interview, September 7, 1972.

Leverette, Emory. Personal interview, September 6, 1972.

Lira, Rudy. Interview with Edward Bobowski, July 7, 1971.

Lira, Rudy. Personal interview, February 29, 1972.

McMurrin, Lee R. Personal interview, August 18, 1972.

Pacheco, Moises. Interview with Edward Bobowski, July 6, 1971.

Pacheco, Raymond. Interview with Edward Bobowski, July 6, 1971.

Palmer, Wayman. Interview with Edward Bobowski, August 9, 1971.

Rodriquez, Celso. Interview with Edward Bobowski, July 8, 1971.

Rodriquez, Celso. Personal interview, February 29, 1972.

Rodriquez, Deloris. Personal interview, February 28, 1972.

Roman, Robert. Personal interview, May 3, 1972.

Velasquez, Baldemar. Interview with Edward Bobowski, August 14, 1971.

Velasquez, Baldemar. Personal interview, February 28, 1972.

Working, Russell. Personal interview, August 31, 1972.

APPENDIX A

A CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MEXICAN AMERICAN CURRICULUM OFFICE

1970

January	North Toledo Corridor Area Corporation formed by the Toledo Metropolitan Mission
January 11	First Guadalupe Advisory Council election; FLOC takes control of Advisory Council
February 22	Disputed, unofficial election for directorship of Guadalupe Center; FLOC wins
March 30	North Toledo Corridor Area Corporation's Education Task Force appears before the Board of Education for the first time
April 14	Lagrange Business and Professional Men's Association sends letter to Superintendent concerning Mexican American demands
April 15	FLOC requests a seat on the City-Wide Committee of the Study for the Seventies
April 18	Guadalupe Center supports FLOC representative for seat on City-Wide Committee
April 27	Progress Report to Board of Education by the administration concerning education of Mexican American students in the school system
	Education Task Force appears before Board of Education
April 29	Letter to Superintendent from Mexican American claiming not all Mexican Americans are represented by FLOC and the Brown Berets
April 30	Letter to Superintendent from Mexican American repudiating demands made by Education Task Force
May 4	School system contacts United States Office of Education concerning applying for a Bi-Lingual Program

May 5	Superintendent responds to letter of concern about Mexican American programs from the Board of Community Relations
May 8	Rival advisory council for Guadalupe Center formed by conservative element
May 14	Ysidro Duran chosen as Director of Guadalupe Center
May 18	FLOC protests choice of director
May 25	Progress Report to Board of Education by the administration
May 26	Director of Guadalupe Center meets with administration
June 1	City-Wide Committee defers seating a representative of the Mexican American community
June 8	Adult Basic Education classes for Mexican Americans begin
June 15	Progress Report to Board of Education by the administration
	Education Task Force appears before Board of Education
June 22	Administration responds to Education Task Force request for information
July 6	City-Wide Committee seats two representatives from Mexican American community; FLOC and *Los Latinos Unidos*
July 7	Education Task Force sends letter to Superintendent expressing continuing concern
July 8	East Toledo Opportunity Center sends letter to Superintendent in support of Education Task Force
	Progress Report to Board of Education by the administration
	Education Task Force appears before Board of Education
July 17	Administration responds to letter from East Toledo Opportunity Center
	Administration responds to Education Task Force letter of May 5

	Administration contacts State Department of Education Title I consultant on Migrant Education concerning need for Mexican American teachers
July 31	Administration holds meeting with Mexican American community representatives and State Department of Education officials
August	Toledo chapter of La Raza Unida formed
August 10	Education Task Force holds meeting to determine next steps
August 17	Education Task Force sends letter to Superintendent for information on a number of educational issues
August 21	Superintendent responds to Education Task Force letter of August 17; refers it to Deputy Superintendent
August 24	Board of Education appoints a Mexican American as counselor for Libbey High School
	Education Task Force appears before Board of Education
September 4	Education Task Force recommends appointment of Mexican American as counselor
September 23	Prospectus for project application for MACO submitted to State Department of Education
September 25	Deputy Superintendent responds to Education Task Force letter of August 17
October	State Department of Education notifies school system that Prospectus of September 23 missed the submission deadline; recommends same to United States Office of Education
December	Economic Opportunity Planning Association removes Toledo Catholic Diocese from control of Guadalupe Center
December	Guadalupe Advisory Council election; conservative element wins
December 10	La Raza Unida representative visits Texas colleges for Personnel Department of school system concerning hiring Mexican American teachers

December 11	Mexican American community representatives invited by school system to preview film and talk about adult education plans

1971

January 4	United States Office of Education notifies school system of availability of Title III, ESEA, Section 306 monies
January 15	Administration meeting concerning developing a Preliminary Proposal for MACO
January 21	Education Task Force requests information from Superintendent
January 22	Administrator meets with two North Toledo priests concerning Mexican American needs
January 25	Meeting with Mexican American community representatives concerning needs assessment for submission of Preliminary Proposal for MACO
January 26	Administration responds to Education Task Force letter of January 21; refuses to release names of Mexican American teachers
January 29	Preliminary Proposal for MACO submitted to United States Office of Education
March 25	United States Office of Education notifies school system to procede with development of a Formal Proposal
April 6	Administration asks Chairman of Advisory Council of Guadalupe Center to attend United States Office of Education meeting
April 12-24	United States Office of Education meeting in Chicago; attended by community representative and school system staff members
May 4	Community Advisory Council meeting; election of temporary chairman, expansion of committee
May 5	Administration meets with reference to power of Community Advisory Council
May 6	Program Officer, USOE visits school system

	Community Advisory Council meeting with USOE representative; election of officers, needs assessment, and discussion of role of council
May 10	Community Advisory Council meeting; needs assessment, and discussion of role of council
May 11	Community Advisory Council meeting; needs assessment, and discussion of role of council
May 12	Community Advisory Council meeting; agreement reached on role and function of council, and target schools identified
May 14	Executive Committee, Community Advisory Council meeting; explanation of target school selection and project components
May 17	Community Advisory Council meeting; approval of project components, target schools, and budget discussion
May 18	Community Advisory Council meeting; criteria for staff, and approval of budget and objectives
May 21	Formal Proposal due in United States Office of Education; handcarried by administrator
May 22	Newspaper article announces submission of Formal Proposal for MACO
June 3	Administration and diocese meet to change a target school selection
June 4	Ninth District U.S. Congressman announces grant award
	Community Advisory Council meeting; informed of effects of freeze on MACO hiring
June 7	Community Advisory Council meeting; letter from council concerning freeze and establishment of personnel committee
June 9	United States Office of Education negotiations conference on MACO in Chicago; Chairman of Community Advisory Council and school system staff members attend
June 10	Executive Committee meeting; no administrators present; report on negotiation conference by chairman

June 14	Community Advisory Council meeting; no administrators present; discussion of need for personnel committee
June 15	Executive Committee meeting; Deputy Superintendent responds to council letter of June 7
June 17	Executive Committee meeting; personnel selection discussion
June 18	Pre-Audit report submitted by IDEA consultant
June 23	Executive Committee meeting; personnel selection discussion
June 25	Executive Committee meeting; personnel selection discussion
June 30	Executive committee meeting; agreement reached on personnel selection procedure
July 1	Community Advisory Council meeting; ratification of personnel selection procedure
July 7	Executive Committee meeting; council membership discussion
July 8	Formal MACO grant award arrives from United States Office of Education
July 12-24	USOE Auditing Conference in Atlanta; Vice-Chairman of council, administration, and evaluator attend
July 26	Personnel Committee meeting; general organization
July 28	Community Advisory Council meeting; appoints members to a Goals Committee
August 2	Goals Committee meeting
August 3	Personnel Committee meeting
August 4	Goals Committee meeting
August 11	Goals Committee meeting
August 12	Personnel Committee meeting
August 16	Goals Committee meeting
August 18	Goals Committee meeting
August 25	Goals Committee meeting

August 27	Goals Committee meeting
September 1	Personnel Committee meeting
September 8	Administration and evaluators meet
September 10	Goals Committee meeting
September 13	Goals Committee meeting
September 15	Director of Guadalupe Center fired
September 16	FLOC pickets Guadalupe Center
September 17	Goals Committee meeting
September 22	Executive Committee meeting scheduled for FLOC headquarters canceled due to protests
September 23	Executive Committee meeting
September 24	Community Advisory Council informed of continued effects of freeze on hiring
September 27	Board of Education appoints Project Supervisor for MACO
	Community Advisory Council sends letter to Superintendent protesting renewed application of freeze to MACO
September 29	Superintendent responds to council letter of September 27; freeze will not apply to MACO
October 3	FLOC holds unofficial recall election of Guadalupe Center Advisory Council; forms own council for Guadalupe Center
October 4	Community Advisory Council holds first meeting with Project Supervisor of MACO

APPENDIX B

193/194

THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF THE COMMUNITY COUNCIL

(As agreed upon, May 12, 1971)

TOLEDO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MANHATTAN AND ELM
TOLEDO, OHIO 43608

THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF THE COMMUNITY COUNCIL FOR THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN CURRICULUM OFFICE, TITLE III, SECTION 306

From the December, 1970 A Manual for Project Applicants and Grantees of the Special Programs and Projects, Title III, Section 306, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education.

"The Office of Education recommends that representatives of all segments of the community is involved in the development and operation of projects and requires that a formal community council be established for each project. . . Care should be taken to assure that the community councils have specifically assigned and meaningful functions during all stages of project development and operation. Each council should play an active part in planning and implementing the project instead of existing merely to certify or approve what has already been decided or accomplished."

Suggested functions and responsibilities as spelled out in the Manual include the following: (underlining added)

"1. Assistance in program planning, including the assessment of needs and the selection of project activities and priorities."

"2. Participation in the establishment of criteria for the selection of project personnel. . . (and criteria in the). . . interviewing and screening of prospective staff members."

"3. Recruitment of volunteers and assistance in the mobilization of community resources."

"4. Assistance in staff development programs. . ."

"5. Assistance in program evaluation activities."

"6. Serve as a channel for complaints and suggestions for program improvements."

"7. Assistance in the dissemination of information about the project throughout the community."

"8. Coordination of the project with the entire local education agency, with professional organizations, and with public and private agencies."

The following comments were made in a meeting of the Community Council on May 6, 1971 by Mr. Gene Engle, Project Officer, Special Projects Branch, Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers, U.S.O.E.: (from an audiotape)

"No authority to go outside the rules and regulations of the State Department of Education of the LEA. The ultimate authority rests with the LEA. The advisory council is as the name implies - advisory. It can become involved in establishing certain criteria, input in program, you know what certain needs you have. This actually should be a cooperative effort between the school and the community so these things can be done in cooperative effort. We can't go way outside the system - we still have to work within the system. The input should be taken under consideration. Now to me it would seem illogical if a particular need existed for a LEA to ignore that. That is one of the purposes and functions of the advisory council. . . to advise the school system of the needs and what they would like to see within the framework of the eligibility. Now if it is something that is impossible to perform because it is illegal I think it would be irresponsible of an advisory board to advise something which is illegal."

"The hiring is the ultimate authority. The hiring rests with the Board. Now you can help establish in the planning - establish certain criteria for the employment of individuals. So you could assist in that . . . It seems to me that it would be illogical as an advisory board to, let's say, hire someone who doesn't have the minimum requirements as established by the state and the LEA."

Nowhere in the above remarks or in the Manual does the concept of community control or ultimate authority appear, either implicitly or explicitly. Accordingly, the Toledo Public Schools views the role and function of the Community Council to be as stated in the eight points listed above from the Manual.

The role of the Chairman is to preside over the formal meetings of the committee, to be held with representatives of the administrative staff of the LEA always present. He may also convene the Executive Board and appoint subcommittees. He will focus the efforts of the committee toward the planning of the implementation and operation of the project. Such efforts will include the defining of specific needs, recommendations and operations of the project. The Manual requires that he "prepare and sign a report" to be included in the narrative section of the formal proposal. One of the questions that must be answered by the Chairman in his report is to "describe the Council's role in the development of this project, including. . .major ideas suggested by the Council which were or were not included in the proposal, and the role of the council in the review of the application before its submission."

The role of the Executive Committee is to meet in the absence of the regular committee to plan in any of the eight function areas, subject to the will of the full committee, and to give advice and counsel to the officers. The Community Advisory Council may delegate responsibility to the Executive Committee as it sees fit.